

## SENATE

THURSDAY, MAY 14, 1942

The Reverend Dr. Howard Hyde Russell, Congregational clergyman of the Central Ohio Association of Congregational Churches, offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, our Father, Thou who dost bestow Thy love and care upon all Thy children, we come to Thee this morning asking for Thy blessing upon all the people of our Nation. May they "love it, obey its laws, respect its flag, and defend it against all enemies."

Bless our beloved President; inspire our fearless Congress; continue to nerve our soldiers and sailors and all the forces of our Allied Nations, until our united efforts shall be crowned with victory. Then inspire us with vision and strength to effect a lasting peace. In the name of Him who came to bring peace on earth, Thy Son, our Saviour, Jesus Christ. Amen.

## THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, May 12, 1942, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

## MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

## MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 2025) to readjust the pay and allowances of personnel of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Public Health Service, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6802) making appropriations for the legislative branch of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes, agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. O'NEAL, Mr. LEAVY, Mr. HARE, Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana, and Mr. STEFAN were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message further announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6927) to amend the National Housing Act, and for other purposes, asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. STEAGALL, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. WOLCOTT, and Mr. GIFFORD were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4476) pro-

viding for sundry matters affecting the Military Establishment; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. MAY, Mr. THOMASON, Mr. HARTER, Mr. ANDREWS, and Mr. SHORT were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message further announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 6979) to authorize an increase of the number of cadets at the United States Military Academy and to provide for maintaining the corps of cadets at authorized strength, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

## ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 210. An act to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, to provide for the regulation of freight forwarders; and

H. R. 6293. An act to establish a Women's Army Auxiliary Corps for service with the Army of the United States.

## SETTLEMENT OF CLAIMS OF AMERICAN NATIONALS AGAINST THE GOVERNMENT OF MEXICO (H. DOC. NO. 722)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed:

*To the Congress of the United States:*

I transmit herewith a report by the Secretary of State recommending the enactment of legislation to provide for the settlement of claims of American nationals against the Government of Mexico comprehended within the terms of agreements concluded by the United States and Mexico.

I commend to the favorable consideration of the Congress the recommendation of the Secretary of State in which I concur.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, May 14, 1942.

[Enclosure: Report.]

## EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

## CONTRACTS ENTERED INTO OR MODIFIED BY THE UNITED STATES MARITIME COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman of the United States Maritime Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, reports of contracts entered into or modified under authority of Public Law 46 cumulative through the period ended March 31, 1942 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Commerce.

## REPORT ON THE RED-CEDAR SHINGLE INDUSTRY

A letter from the Acting Chairman of the United States Tariff Commission, submitting, in response to Senate Resolution 79, Seventy-seventh Congress, its report on an investigation with respect to "the effect upon the red-cedar shingle industry in the United States of importations of red-cedar shingles from Canada" (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Finance.

## DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, lists of papers and documents on the files of the Departments of War (3), Justice, Navy, and Interior (4), and the War Production Board, which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking toward their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The VICE PRESIDENT appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

## PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

## By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A letter in the nature of a petition from Jay O. Ferch, of Milwaukee, Wis., praying for the enactment of the bill (S. 860) to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States and to provide for the suppression of vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; ordered to lie on the table.

A concurrent resolution of the Legislative Assembly of Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Military Affairs:

"Concurrent resolution: to request the War Department and the War Production Board and other competent authorities to favor Puerto Rican industry in orders for supplies that can be produced locally for the armed forces

"Whereas due to the scarcity of various raw materials the War Production Board has established control in the production and distribution of said raw materials, so that the same may be used in the manufacture of supplies for the armed forces;

"Whereas numerous industries established in the continental United States, although they have suspended production for civil uses, due to the scarcity of some raw materials, continue nevertheless to operate, manufacturing supplies for the armed forces;

"Whereas Puerto Rican industries to which the privilege of priority in the importation of raw materials has not been granted, will necessarily have to close their doors at a near date, numerous workmen being left without work; and

"Whereas such Puerto Rican industries could subsist and continue to operate, although in a limited form, during the present emergency if they were given an opportunity to manufacture some of the supplies used by the armed forces in Puerto Rico, the greater part of which supplies are now purchased by the War Department from the industries established in the continental United States: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of Puerto Rico (the Senate of Puerto Rico concurring):

"First. To request the War Department and the War Production Board, for the purpose of preventing a total collapse of a great number of Puerto Rican industries which cannot import raw materials for civil purposes, as said raw materials are frozen for the use of the armed forces, to order from Puerto Rican industries a part of such supplies as the military authorities in Puerto Rico may need and which can be manufactured in Puerto Rico.

"Second. That a copy of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States of America, to the Secretary of War, to the Chairman of the War Production Board, to the Secretary of the Interior of the United

States, to the Chief of the Division of Territories and Insular Possessions, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, to the President of the Senate of the United States, to the Resident Commissioner in Washington, and to the Governor of Puerto Rico."

By Mr. RADCLIFFE:

A resolution adopted by the Council of the City of Baltimore, Md., protesting against the enactment of legislation to increase the Federal taxes on gasoline and lubricating oil; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. CAPPER:

Petitions, numerous signed, of sundry citizens of La Harpe and Oil Hill, in the State of Kansas, praying for the enactment of the bill (S. 860) to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States and to provide for the suppression of vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; ordered to lie on the table.

#### PROHIBITION OF LIQUOR SALES AND SUPPRESSION OF VICE AROUND MILITARY CAMPS—PETITION

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I send to the desk, and ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred, a petition signed by a large number of members of the First Christian Church of Ottawa, Kans., urging the Congress to take whatever steps may be necessary in order to protect our men in military training from the menace of liquor, prostitution, and gambling. I am wholeheartedly in favor of such constructive legislation and hope favorable action will be taken at an early date.

There being no objection, the petition was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, without all the signatures attached thereto, as follows:

MAY 1, 1942.

TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES,  
Washington, D. C.:

We, the undersigned citizens, members of the First Christian (Disciples of Christ) Church, Ottawa, Kans., respectfully appeal to you as Commander in Chief of our Army and Navy, and to the Members of Congress, to take whatever steps are necessary to protect our men in uniform from the menace of liquor, prostitution, and gambling. We are greatly disturbed by the multiplied reports, as to the immoral conditions surrounding our men in camp. The church has made a great investment in her men, and she feels that the Government should protect them, while serving it.

(Signed by Rev. David H. Shields and members of the First Christian Church of Ottawa, Kans.)

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, this petition was accompanied by a brief statement by Rev. David H. Shields, pastor of the First Christian Church, of Ottawa, Kans., which I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

There is a growing demand, all over the country, that our Government furnish as much protection, at least, to our men in uniform, as it did during the last war. It seems reasonable that the parents of these men should demand a "safety zone" around the camps and war industries, from which liquor, prostitution, and gambling should be excluded.

DAVID H. SHIELDS,  
First Christian Church, Ottawa, Kans.

#### PROHIBITION OF LIQUOR SALES AND SUPPRESSION OF VICE AROUND MILITARY CAMPS

Mr. BANKHEAD presented a resolution adopted by the congregation of the First Methodist Church of Anniston, Ala., at a union service on April 19, 1942, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senator JOHN H. BANKHEAD,

Senate Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR BANKHEAD: The congregation assembled at the union service at the First Methodist Church, Anniston, Ala., on April 19, 1942, requested the undersigned to write to you, informing you of the action taken by the congregation.

The congregation, composed of members of various churches in Anniston, voted to petition the Congress of the United States to pass Senate bill 860, or protective legislation for our armed forces from the liquor and vice traffic similar to that adopted in 1917.

The congregation requested that you report this action on the floor of the Senate and have it incorporated in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

W. G. Henry, pastor, First Methodist Church, Anniston, Ala.; S. O. Kimbrough, district superintendent, Anniston district; Melton Clark, pastor, Presbyterian Church; Festus N. Wolfe, pastor, Church of Disciples of Christ; J. F. T. Brown, pastor, McCoy Methodist Church; C. L. Cash, secretary, Pastors Union, Anniston, Ala.

#### PROHIBITION OF LIQUOR SALES AND SUPPRESSION OF VICE AROUND MILITARY CAMPS—PETITIONS

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, I present for noting in the RECORD and appropriate reference numerous petitions from 4,362 citizens of the United States, praying for the prompt and favorable consideration of Senate bill 860, in relation to the liquor traffic in the vicinity of military camps, and so forth.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The petitions presented by the Senator from Texas will be noted and lie on the table.

The petitions presented by Mr. O'DANIEL are as follows:

	Number of signers
Alabama: Birmingham.....	273
California: Los Angeles.....	16
Iowa:	
Clarinda.....	11
Green Mountain.....	63
Illinois: Salem.....	235
New York:	
Buffalo.....	60
Chadwick.....	2,256
Honeoye Falls.....	11
Johnsonburg.....	38
Newburgh.....	248
Owego.....	41
Ransomville.....	26
Rochester.....	43
South Otsello.....	19
Syracuse.....	23
Watervliet.....	17
Wellsville.....	7
Tennessee: Maryville.....	365
Washington:	
Acme.....	44
Bellingham.....	50
Blaine.....	51
Longview.....	7
Seattle.....	182
Snohomish.....	128
Sumner.....	132
Miscellaneous.....	11
Total.....	4,362

#### ONE HUNDRED AND FIFTY-FIRST ANNIVERSARY OF POLISH CONSTITUTION DAY—LETTER FROM POLISH AMBASSADOR

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, on the one hundred and fifty-first anniversary of the Constitution Day of Poland the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. Brown] and the senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMATHERS] prepared a statement of greetings and felicitations addressed to the Polish people. The Senator from New Jersey had the statement translated into several languages, and sent it to the people of Poland. The statement was transcribed on two records.

In appreciation of the act of those two Senators and their tribute to Poland's contribution to liberty, the Ambassador of Poland wrote a very complimentary note, which the Secretary of State has sent to the Secretary of the Senate. I ask unanimous consent that the letters be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,  
Washington, May 13, 1942.

Secretary, United States Senate:

The Secretary of State presents his compliments to the Secretary of the United States Senate and encloses a copy of a note dated May 6, 1942, from the Ambassador of Poland expressing appreciation of the many messages of support which were addressed to Poland and the people of Poland on May 3, Poland's Constitution Day.

[Enclosure from Polish Ambassador, May 6, 1942.]

MAY 6, 1942.

The Honorable CORDELL HULL,  
Secretary of State.

Sir: I have the honor to convey on behalf of the Polish Government as well as in my own, deep gratitude and highest appreciation for the numerous expressions of friendship and support addressed to Poland and the Polish people in the course of the last few days on the occasion of May 3, Poland's Constitution Day. These powerful manifestations of American friendship on the part of the United States administration, of Members of the United States Congress, of State and local authorities, and of the American press and radio, will greatly encourage the Polish people. They will regard them as new and valuable proofs of American friendship and support extended to them at a time when they are straining all their efforts, in the face of brutal oppression and tyranny, to carry on the fight as one of the United Nations in defense of the highest principles of humanity.

I have the honor to request you kindly to convey my thanks to the Government departments, the military and civilian authorities, and the Congress of the United States.

Accept, Sir, the renewed assurances of my highest consideration.

J. CIECHANOWSKI.

#### REPORT OF THE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE FILED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under authority of the order of the 12th instant,

Mr. RUSSELL, from the Committee on Appropriations, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 6709) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes, reported it on May 13, 1942, with amendments, and submitted a report (No. 1323) thereon.



## REPORTS OF THE COMMITTEE ON CLAIMS

The following reports of the Committee on Claims were submitted:

By Mr. ROSIER:

S. 2420. A bill for the relief of Isabelle Fuller; without amendment (Rept. No. 1324);  
H. R. 4941. A bill for the relief of J. C. Lemon, Louis McCoy, and Patricia McCoy; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1327);

H. R. 6033. A bill for the relief of William Tipton, Mrs. William Tipton, and Mrs. Eula Nelson; with amendments (Rept. No. 1328);

H. R. 6365. A bill for the relief of Commander Cato D. Glover; without amendment (Rept. No. 1325); and

H. R. 6748. A bill for the relief of Fred Farner and Doris M. Schroeder; without amendment (Rept. No. 1326).

By Mr. STEWART:

S. 1220. A bill for the relief of G. C. Barco; with amendments (Rept. No. 1334);

S. 2099. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Reita M. Lary; without amendment (Rept. No. 1329);

H. R. 2014. A bill for the relief of Carl L. Jones; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1332);

H. R. 2427. A bill for the relief of George P. Crawford; without amendment (Rept. No. 1330);

H. R. 2646. A bill for the relief of L. W. Marek, Jr.; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1333); and

H. R. 2934. A bill for the relief of L. H. Martin; without amendment (Rept. No. 1331).

By Mr. CAPPER:

S. 2432. A bill for the relief of Almos W. Glasgow; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1335);

H. R. 3201. A bill for the relief of Walter P. Williams, Jr.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1337);

H. R. 4526. A bill for the relief of Joseph Donatelli and Rose Donatelli; without amendment (Rept. No. 1338);

H. R. 5527. A bill for the relief of Gerney M. Claiborne; without amendment (Rept. No. 1339); and

H. R. 5920. A bill for the relief of E. A. Williams; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1336).

By Mr. TUNNELL:

H. R. 2925. A bill for the relief of Wiley W. Watkins; without amendment (Rept. No. 1340);

H. R. 4953. A bill for the relief of Emil Lassila, Martha Lassila, Ellen Huhta, and Sylvia Huhta; with amendments (Rept. No. 1341); and

H. R. 6557. A bill for the relief of James Gilmore and Marian E. Gilmore; with amendments (Rept. No. 1342).

By Mr. BROWN:

S. 2165. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Lila A. Wemp; without amendment (Rept. No. 1343);

S. 2470. A bill for the relief of Eileen Collins Treacy; without amendment (Rept. No. 1344); and

H. R. 6797. A bill for the relief of the estate of Tom Gentry; without amendment (Rept. No. 1345).

## REPORTS ON DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Mr. BARKLEY, from the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers, to which were referred, for examination and recommendation, three lists of records transmitted to the Senate by the Archivist of the United States, which appeared to have no permanent value or historical interest, submitted reports thereon pursuant to law.

## APPOINTMENT OF JAMES W. MURPHY AND JOHN D. RHODES AS OFFICIAL REPORTERS OF THE SENATE

Mr. HAYDEN. By direction of the Committee on Printing I report a resolution from that committee and ask

unanimous consent for its present consideration.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 249) was considered and agreed to, as follows:

*Resolved*, That James W. Murphy and John D. Rhodes are hereby appointed Official Reporters for reporting the proceedings and debates of the Senate until further order of the Senate, subject to all the duties and obligations of the contract made with D. F. Murphy, deceased, late reporter of the Senate, and to the supervision and control of the Committee on Printing on behalf of the Senate in all respects therein provided, and to receive payment for such services according to law: *Provided*, That said James W. Murphy and said John D. Rhodes be paid for services rendered in reporting the proceedings and debates of the Senate at the rate allowable by law for such services from May 6, 1942, to the date upon which this resolution is agreed to by the Senate, both dates inclusive: *Provided further*, That in the event of the death of either said James W. Murphy or said John D. Rhodes during any recess or adjourned period of the Senate, the survivor shall discharge all the duties and obligations imposed upon the Official Reporters appointed by this resolution, and said survivor shall receive payment for such services according to law until the further order of the Senate.

## EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. GEORGE, as in executive session, from the Committee on Finance, reported favorably the following nominations:

Senior surgeons to be medical directors in the United States Public Health Service, to rank as such from the dates set opposite their names:

John D. Reichard, May 12, 1942.

Vance B. Murray, July 26, 1942.

Surgeons to be senior surgeons in the United States Public Health Service, to rank as such from the dates set opposite their names:

Winfield K. Sharp, Jr., June 27, 1942.

Fred T. Foard, June 27, 1942.

Ralph L. Lawrence, June 30, 1942.

## BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. BANKHEAD:

S. 2522. A bill to amend section 385 of the act of 1938, as amended, so as to facilitate farmers in the service of the United States receiving the benefits of the farm program; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma:

S. 2523. A bill for the relief of John E. Creighton (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. TYDINGS:

S. 2524. A bill to allow an additional period of six months in which certain members of the Officers' Reserve Corps and the Enlisted Reserve Corps of the Army, or their beneficiaries, may make claim for benefits under the act of July 18, 1940; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. ROSIER. Mr. President, it seems that some consideration ought to be given by the Congress to the question of enabling the men in the Army and the Navy to vote in the coming congressional elections. So I introduce a bill bearing on that subject for reference to the appropriate committee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill of the Senator from West Virginia will be

received and referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

By Mr. ROSIER:

S. 2525. A bill to regulate and permit the voting of soldiers and sailors in the military service of the United States of America, serving within continental United States of America; to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

By Mr. WALSH:

S. 2526. A bill to amend Section 1 of the act entitled "An act to authorize the Philadelphia, Baltimore, and Washington Railroad Co. to extend its present track connection with the United States navy yard so as to provide adequate railroad facilities in connection with the development of Buzzards Point as an industrial area in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved June 18, 1932 (47 Stat. 322), as amended by the act approved June 20, 1939 (53 Stat. 849); to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

(Mr. WALSH also introduced Senate bill 2527, which was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs, and appears under a separate heading.)

Mr. BARKLEY. On behalf of the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, who is absent because of death in his family, I present a bill to provide for the settlement of the claims by the Government of the United States on behalf of American nationals against the Government of Mexico and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be appropriately referred.

By Mr. BARKLEY (for Mr. CONNALLY):

S. 2528. A bill to provide for the settlement of claims of the Government of the United States on behalf of American nationals against the Government of Mexico comprehended within the terms of agreements concluded by the United States and Mexico; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I introduce a joint resolution providing an authorization for an appropriation of an additional million dollars for the fiscal year 1943 for the purpose of carrying out the Vocational Rehabilitation Act of June 2, 1920, as amended. I ask that it be referred to the appropriate committee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution of the Senator from Wisconsin will be received and referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. LA FOLLETTE:

S. J. Res. 149. Joint resolution to authorize an additional appropriation of \$1,000,000, for the fiscal year 1943, for the purpose of carrying out the Vocational Rehabilitation Act of June 2, 1920, as amended; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

## WOMAN'S AUXILIARY NAVAL RESERVE

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, recently the House of Representatives passed a bill, H. R. 6807, entitled "A bill to establish a Woman's Auxiliary in the Naval Reserve," and a similar bill, S. 2338, was introduced in the Senate by the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS], which were referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs of the Senate.

The committee was informed that these bills were not introduced at the request of the Navy Department. Thereafter the Committee on Naval Affairs communicated with the Navy Department

making some suggestions for changes in these bills, and asked the Navy Department to consider the same and to make recommendations to the committee as to just what form of legislation was desired with reference to the establishment of a Woman's Auxiliary Reserve in the Navy.

On May 11, 1942, the Bureau of Navigation sent a letter to the chairman of the Senate Committee on Naval Affairs setting forth its views and recommendations.

I now introduce the bill proposed by the Navy Department and ask unanimous consent that the bill and the letter of the Bureau of Navigation be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (S. 2527) to expedite the war effort by releasing officers and men for duty at sea and their replacement by women in the shore establishment of the Navy, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Naval Reserve Act of 1938, as amended, is further amended by adding after section 401 thereof an additional title as follows:

**"TITLE V. WOMEN'S AUXILIARY RESERVE"**

"Sec. 501. A Women's Auxiliary Reserve is hereby established which shall be a branch of the Naval Reserve and shall be administered under the same provisions in all respects (except as may be necessary to adapt said provisions to the Women's Auxiliary Reserve, or as specifically provided herein) as those contained in this act or which may hereafter be enacted with respect to the Volunteer Reserve. Appointments and enlistments in the Women's Auxiliary Reserve shall be made only in time of war and for periods to expire not later than 6 months after the termination of war.

"Sec. 502. Members of the Women's Auxiliary Reserve may be commissioned or enlisted in such appropriate ranks and ratings, corresponding to those of the regular Navy, as may be prescribed by the Secretary of the Navy: *Provided*, That there shall not be more than 1 officer in the grade of lieutenant commander, nor more than 35 officers in the grade of lieutenant, and that the number of officers in the grade of lieutenant (junior grade) shall not exceed 35 percent of the total number of commissioned officers: *And provided further*, That military authority of officers commissioned under the provisions of this act may be exercised over women of the Auxiliary Reserve only and is limited to the administration of the Women's Auxiliary Reserve.

"Sec. 503. The Reserve established by this title shall be composed of members who have attained the age of 20 years.

"Sec. 504. Members of the Women's Auxiliary Reserve shall be restricted to the performance of shore duty only and shall not be assigned to duty on board vessels of the Navy or in combat aircraft.

"Sec. 505. Members of the Women's Auxiliary Reserve shall not be used to replace civil service personnel employed in the naval establishment, but shall be composed of women trained and qualified for duty in the shore establishment of the Navy to release male officers and enlisted men of the naval service for duty at sea.

"Sec. 506. The benefits provided by section 4 of the act approved August 27, 1940 (Public, No. 775, 76th Cong.), and by the act approved March 17, 1941 (Public Law No. 16, 77th Cong.), shall not be applicable to members

of the Women's Auxiliary Reserve who suffer disability or death in line of duty from disease or injury while employed on active duty: *Provided*, That if any member of the Women's Auxiliary Reserve suffers disability or death from disease or injury incurred in line of duty while employed on active duty, she or her beneficiaries shall be entitled to all the benefits prescribed by law for civil employees of the United States who are physically injured or who die as a result thereof.

"Sec. 507. The Secretary of the Navy shall fix the money value of the articles of uniform and equipment which members of the Women's Auxiliary Reserve are required to have upon their first reporting for active duty: *Provided*, That he may authorize such articles of uniform and equipment, or parts thereof, to be issued in kind, or, in lieu thereof, that payment in cash of the money value fixed in accordance with the foregoing, not to exceed \$200, be made to members so ordered to active duty, for the purchase of such articles of uniform and equipment."

The letter presented by Mr. WALSH in connection with Senate bill 2527 is as follows:

NAVY DEPARTMENT,  
BUREAU OF NAVIGATION,  
Washington, D. C., May 11, 1942.

MY DEAR SENATOR WALSH: I am pleased to have your views, and those of the members of your committee, expressed in your letter of April 30, 1942, regarding the establishment of a Women's Auxiliary Reserve in the Navy. These views have received careful consideration and study.

As the Chief of the Personnel Bureau of the Navy Department I am charged with supplying trained personnel to man the fleet and personnel to man the shore establishment to support this fleet. In carrying out my duties it is imperative that I plan sufficiently in advance to insure the availability of adequate trained personnel to man this establishment effectively.

In this total war effort it is inevitable that manpower must be conserved for use in the most effective manner to promote this effort.

The Chief of the Bureau of Navigation, months before the declaration of war, issued instructions to all shore activities to employ civil-service personnel wherever practicable in positions then being filled by enlisted personnel. This has been done, but there are still many billets which must be filled by service personnel.

A survey of personnel assignments indicates that many officers and enlisted men are now serving on shore in billets requiring young, active individuals. Their service can be used at sea. It is considered necessary that they be members of the Naval Reserve because of—

1. The nature of their duties;
2. The necessity for their being available at any time or place;
3. Discipline; and
4. Permanency of personnel.

Civil-service personnel do not meet these particular requirements. They may resign at any time and are not subject to transfer to stations where their services may be required.

I have been aware of many of the objections mentioned in your letter, such as the numbers in the various ranks, and the combatant status of such women. It was planned to cover these objections in the regulations for administering the bill.

To meet most of your objections, I have prepared a substitute measure which includes, in the form of legislation, many of the regulations which it was contemplated to issue in administering this Reserve and which are satisfactory to the Bureau. A copy of the proposed substitute is submitted for consideration.

An analysis of the proposed substitute is presented:

(a) Section 501 authorizes the establishment of a new branch of the Naval Reserve, to be known as the Women's Auxiliary Reserve. Except as hereafter provided, this Reserve is to be administered under the same conditions as are now applicable to the Volunteer Reserve. Appointments and enlistments may be made only in time of war; no later than 6 months after the termination of war, personnel so appointed or enlisted are to be discharged.

(b) Section 502 provides for the commissioning or enlistment of women in ranks or rates corresponding to those of the Regular Navy. The highest rank is to be that of lieutenant commander, with only one such appointment authorized. No more than 35 members may serve in the grade of lieutenant. Of the total number of officers appointed, no more than 35 percent may serve in the rank of lieutenant (junior grade). It is further provided that the military authority of officers appointed under this act will be exercised only over women of the Auxiliary Reserve and is limited to the administration of this branch of the Reserve.

(c) Section 503 provides a minimum age of 20 years for members appointed in this Reserve.

(d) Section 504 restricts the performance of duty of women of the Reserve to shore duty only and specifically prohibits assignment on board ships of the Navy or in combat aircraft.

(e) Section 505 provides that members of the Women's Auxiliary Reserve may not replace civil-service personnel employed in the Naval Establishment, and that they may be used only to replace males of the Reserve on shore duty.

(f) By the provisions of section 506, members of the Women's Auxiliary Reserve who suffer disability or death in line of duty will receive the same benefits prescribed by law for civil employees of the United States. This section specifically makes inapplicable the provisions of the present law governing the Naval Reserve wherein male members receive retirement and other benefits the same as personnel of the Regular Navy.

(g) Section 507 authorizes the Secretary of the Navy to establish the articles of uniform and equipment which members of the Women's Auxiliary Reserve are required to have. Such articles may be provided in kind or cash in lieu thereof. The money value of the full outfit of uniform and equipment is estimated to be about \$200.

I shall be pleased to discuss further any of the features of the Bureau's new proposal with you at your convenience if you should so desire.

With kind personal regards, I am,  
Very sincerely yours,  
RANDALL JACOBS,  
Rear Admiral, United States Navy,  
Chief of Bureau.

HON. DAVID I. WALSH,  
Chairman, Naval Affairs Committee,  
United States Senate.

**HOUSE BILL REFERRED**

The bill (H. R. 6979) to authorize an increase of the number of cadets at the United States Military Academy and to provide for maintaining the corps of cadets at authorized strength, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

**PREFERENCE RIGHT TO CERTAIN OIL AND GAS LESSEES—AMENDMENT**

Mr. McNARY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 6071) to grant a preference



right to certain oil and gas lessees, which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys and ordered to be printed.

#### NOTICES OF MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULE—AMENDMENTS

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma submitted the following notice in writing:

In accordance with rule XL of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that it is my intention to move to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI for the purpose of proposing to the bill (H. R. 6709) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes, the following amendment, namely:

On page 80, after line 25, to insert the following:

"Reimbursement of participants in cotton producers' pool: Not to exceed \$332,344 of the funds of the Commodity Credit Corporation shall be available for the purpose of enabling such Corporation to pay, and such Corporation is authorized and directed to pay pursuant to such regulations as the Secretary of Agriculture may prescribe, to any holder of record, as of May 1, 1937, of a participation trust certificate (Agricultural Adjustment Administration Form C-5-1) of the 1933 cotton producers' pool a sum equal to \$2.40 per bale for each bale which such certificate evidenced that such holder held in such pool. Payments made under the provisions of this paragraph shall be deemed to be in full and complete satisfaction of the claims of the payees against the United States for reimbursement of the amounts charged to them as carrying charges on the cotton which they held in such pool."

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma also submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 6709) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

(For text of amendment referred to, see the foregoing notice.)

Mr. RUSSELL submitted the following notice in writing:

In accordance with rule XL of the Standing Rules of the Senate I hereby give notice in writing that it is my intention to move to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI for the purpose of proposing to the bill (H. R. 6709) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes, the following amendment, namely:

On page 7, line 18, after the word "Solicitor", to insert the following: "including salary of the Solicitor at \$9,200 per annum, and".

Mr. RUSSELL also submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 6709) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

(For text of amendment referred to, see the foregoing notice.)

Mr. RUSSELL also submitted the following notice in writing:

In accordance with Rule XL of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that it is my intention to move to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI for the purpose of proposing to the bill (H. R. 6709)

making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes, the following amendment, namely:

On page 77, line 2, after the word "payments", to insert the following: "Provided further, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, persons who in 1942 carry out farming operations as tenants or sharecroppers on cropland owned by the United States Government and who comply with the terms and conditions of the 1942 agricultural conservation program, formulated pursuant to sections 7 to 17, inclusive, of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, shall be entitled to apply for and receive payments, or to retain payments heretofore made, for their participation in said program to the same extent as other producers."

Mr. RUSSELL also submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 6709) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

(For text of amendment referred to, see the foregoing notice.)

#### INVESTIGATION AS TO PROGRESS IN CONSTRUCTION OF THE ALASKAN HIGHWAY

Mr. DOWNEY submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 246), which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs:

*Resolved*, That the Committee on Military Affairs, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is hereby authorized and directed to make a full and complete investigation with respect to the progress being made in constructing the so-called Alaskan Highway and the measures which are being taken and which are necessary to expedite the construction of such highway. The committee shall report to the Senate as soon as practicable the results of such investigation, together with its recommendations, if any, for necessary legislation.

For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Seventy-seventh and succeeding Congresses, to employ such clerical and other assistants, to require by subpoena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words. The expenses of the committee, which shall not exceed \$5,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

#### SPECIAL ASSISTANT, COMMITTEE ON MILITARY AFFAIRS

Mr. REYNOLDS submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 247), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

*Resolved*, That the Committee on Military Affairs hereby is authorized to employ, during the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1942, a special assistant to be paid at the rate of \$3,300 per annum from the contingent fund of the Senate.

#### RATIONING OF GASOLINE

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I submit a resolution, a copy of which I have left at the desk and ask that it be read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read.

The Chief Clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 248), as follows:

Whereas wartime difficulties in transporting petroleum products to the Atlantic States have become so acute as to necessitate the rationing of gasoline; and

Whereas the only sound and just basis for such rationing of gasoline is that of need; and

Whereas the granting of special privileges or exemptions to Government officials with respect to the use of gasoline which relieve them from the restrictions applying to the people as a whole is a violation of democratic principles: Therefore be it

*Resolved*, That it is the sense of the Senate that the Members thereof shall collectively and individually waive any special rights, privileges, or exemptions they may be accorded under the terms of any gasoline rationing order, and shall consider themselves bound by honor to the acceptance of the rationing restrictions which are of general application.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes, Mr. President; there is.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I thought I still had the floor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Wisconsin insist on the point of no quorum?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I insist on the point of no quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gillette	O'Daniel
Andrews	Glass	O'Mahoney
Austin	Green	Pepper
Ball	Gurney	Reynolds
Bankhead	Hatch	Rosier
Barkley	Hayden	Russell
Bilbo	Herring	Schwartz
Bone	Hill	Smathers
Brooks	Holman	Smith
Brown	Hughes	Spencer
Bulow	Johnson, Calif.	Stewart
Bunker	Johnson, Colo.	Taft
Butler	La Follette	Thomas, Okla.
Byrd	Langer	Truman
Capper	Lee	Tunnell
Caraway	McCarran	Tydings
Chandler	McFarland	Vandenberg
Chavez	McKellar	Van Nuys
Clark, Idaho	McNary	Wagner
Clark, Mo.	Maloney	Walsh
Danaher	Maybank	Wheeler
Downey	Millikin	White
Doxey	Murdock	Willis
George	Norris	
Gerry	Nye	

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], and the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD] are members of the Committee to Investigate National Defense and are therefore necessarily absent.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Illinois

[Mr. LUCAS], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. RADCLIFFE], the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN] are necessarily absent.

Mr. AUSTIN. The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is absent as a result of an injury and illness.

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON] and the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] are out of the city in attendance upon the sessions of the so-called Truman Committee.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is absent on official business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Seventy-three Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, the resolution which I have offered was read just prior to the quorum call. The resolution merely states as the policy of the Members of the Senate of the United States that they will consider themselves in honor bound to use such gasoline as they may receive under their cards only for essential purposes. I wish to declare that the resolution is not an implied criticism of any Member of the Senate, it is not a discussion of who is or who is not entitled to an X card; it is the declaration of this body that in the receipt of our gasoline we will consider ourselves subject to the same standards which apply to the other people of this Nation.

Mr. President, several weeks ago I introduced a bill proposing to give to the President of the United States the discretionary power to commandeer automobiles and parts thereof. I introduced the bill because I know this Nation is approaching a desperate condition in respect to gasoline and rubber.

All tankers have now been taken off the Atlantic coastal route; the seriousness of this action is revealed by the fact that 95 percent of our eastern petroleum products used to come in by those tankers. The reserves of our petroleum products on the Atlantic seaboard consequently are steadily falling. What 90 days or 6 months may bring to this Nation no one can say. Unless we act with unselfishness and energy to conserve the gasoline, rubber, and cars we have and can secure, we will find ourselves passing into a crisis from which we may not easily recover.

Here on the Atlantic seaboard from today forward millions of our citizens face the loss of their businesses and their means of livelihood. The daily life of every family in this great segment of the United States will be altered and dis-

turbed in large or small degree by this rationing of gasoline.

I assume that under these trying war conditions every Senator of the United States will wish to declare to the people of the Nation that the same regulations which will be applied to them will be applied to us, and that the same sacrifices made by them will be made by us.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I do not happen to be the holder of an X card, but I should like to ask the Senator whether it is not a fact that any Member of the Senate who is the holder of an X card has signed a statement that he will not use his card for anything except official purposes. I also wish to inquire whether the Senator thinks his colleagues who have thus given their word over their signatures are untrustworthy and need to be rededicated to the objective which he correctly describes.

Mr. DOWNEY. Replying to the distinguished Senator from Michigan, I answer unequivocally, "No"; I do not consider my colleagues untrustworthy or that there is a necessity of rededication; but I do say to the Members of this distinguished body that we should here officially declare to the people of this Nation what our own policy is. We should let the newspapers of America carry, under the same banner headlines in which they have carried the stories of the X cards, our solemn official declaration of policy.

Mr. President, I say that if the people of the United States should even suspect that we here in Washington were exercising special privileges not granted the people as a whole, we could never enforce any rationing program. I can imagine no way of so rapidly breaking down the morale of the American people as by leading them to believe that we are enjoying in this matter of gas rationing rights denied to them.

I am willing to assume that what the distinguished senior Senator from Michigan has said is entirely true, that not one single Senator will consider using his card except to secure gasoline for essential purposes. So I am merely stating my own humble opinion that, for the confidence of the American people in the Senate, for our national morale and well-being, it would be a wise policy for this body to declare officially to the people of the United States that we do intend to abide by the common rule—the rule of need—in the rationing of gasoline.

Mr. President, it is my desire to ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. BARKLEY and several other Senators addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. Reserving the right to object, I wish to express a few views which I entertain with reference to not only the proposed resolution, but the teapot explosion which brings it forth.

I am not one of those Senators who feel that it is necessary for the Senate

to pass a resolution binding the membership to be honorable men. If I thought it were necessary to pass a resolution to make us honorable, I would not want to be a Member of this body. I have not yet registered; I shall register before the day is over, and I do not know what sort of a card I shall take, but I shall take whatever I am entitled to, without any apologies to anyone, in Washington or outside Washington.

Every time something is done that even recognizes Members of Congress as officials of the Government, some one throws a fit. I remember when it became necessary, a few years ago, because of the crowded conditions on the streets in Washington, for Members of Congress to park their cars in front of Government buildings in order that they might go into them and transact business, for which they are paid, and which it is their duty to transact.

Congress passed a law giving to every owner of a car which has a congressional tag upon it the right to park that car in front of a public building if the owner is there on official business. I have here a card which I think contains the language of the law giving Members of Congress the right to park their cars in front of the Treasury and State Department Buildings and other public buildings. At the time those cards were issued certain persons raised Cain about it. They said that Members of Congress were enjoying a privilege which no one else enjoyed; that is, the right to park in front of public buildings their cars which they drove there on official business. Of course, when that law was passed, the newspapers in the District of Columbia proceeded at once to denounce Members of Congress because they were enjoying a special privilege which no one else in the District of Columbia enjoyed—the right to park a car in front of a public building. I have very rarely exercised that right, but I have done so on a few occasions, and I make no apology for that either.

Mr. President, we are supposed to be busy men here, and I know that we are busy men here, regardless of opinions to the contrary expressed by some persons who do not follow us in our work day by day or week by week. We might waive the right to park our automobiles with congressional tags on them in front of a public building. We might go down into Potomac Park and park our automobiles and walk to the public buildings in order to transact public business. I presume there are some persons in the District of Columbia who think that is what we ought to do. When we were accorded that privilege we were denounced here in the District of Columbia, and some photographs were taken of automobiles with congressional tags upon them, parked in front of the Treasury Department, or the State Department, or the District Building, in order to try to create the impression that we were enjoying a right which no one else enjoyed, and that we were not entitled to enjoy it, notwithstanding we were at those buildings on official business.



Mr. President, I think I have as much right to park my car in front of the Treasury of the United States as the Secretary of the Treasury has to park his car in front of the Capitol, or as much right to park in front of other departmental buildings as the Secretary of State, or the Secretary of War, or the Secretary of the Navy, or one of the undersecretaries, or first, second, third, fourth, or fifth assistant secretaries have to park their cars in front of the Capitol.

Simply because I do so park my car does not mean that I am enjoying a privilege which any other official may not enjoy. But the same hullabaloo was raised about that which is now being raised about the classification of a United States Senator or a Representative as a Federal official.

What are we if we are not Federal officials? Are we State officers? We did not classify ourselves. We passed a law providing for price regulation and rationing, but we did not put ourselves in any class. We did not exempt ourselves in the law, but in the regulations which were issued by the Price Administrator, he specified certain persons who were entitled to what he called X cards. Until I saw all this publicity in the newspapers, I did not know there was an X card. I did not know the difference between an X card and a Y card or an A or B card. The Price Administrator, however, made a classification, which is contained in a statement issued yesterday I believe by the Price Administrator, after one of the local newspapers all the way across the front page in a headline announced that Congressmen had been denied their X cards, and they had been taken away from them, which is not true. This is a statement which the Price Administrator issued yesterday:

Section 1394.32 of the Emergency Gasoline Rationing Regulations authorizes the issuance of a class X card if all or substantially all of the use of the vehicle in question is certified by the applicant to be for the official business of a Federal, State, local, or foreign government or government agency.

I suppose we come under the classification of Federal. The statement however goes on to say that any State organization or State official may also get a class X card. Not only the governor, but the lieutenant governor, and all State officers and all State employees who are using their cars on official business can get X cards.

Mr. President, is there anything more important than transacting the business of the people? Perhaps there is something more important than that. On the first day of registration, day before yesterday, 6,000 persons were given X cards in the District of Columbia. About 200 of them happened to be Members of Congress, and they were the only members of the 6,000 group who received any publicity. They were denounced; 5,800 others who received X cards came in for no denunciation, for no criticism. Not only the governor and all State officers can get X cards, but the mayor of every

town, and city commissioners, and all other city officers who travel on official business, can receive X cards, and representatives of foreign governments or foreign agencies are also entitled to X cards.

Mr. President, I do not know what the experience of other Senators is, but I think that even if we were not honorable men, and must agree to resolutions declaring ourselves to be honorable, the very physical facts make it impossible for any of us to go on a gasoline spree under an X card. It takes 2 gallons of gasoline a day for me to travel from my house to my office and back. If I call at a Government department, as I frequently do, it takes more gallons. I am only giving my own case, because I know it better than that of anyone else but I imagine every other Senator finds himself in a similar situation. What good would a 3-gallon a week card do me? If I were limited to such an amount of gasoline I would have to park my automobile for the duration of the war and ride in taxicabs, but I would not save any gasoline by so doing, because it takes as much gasoline for a taxicab to convey me from my house in Washington to my office and back again as would be consumed in using my own car for that purpose. And if I should be obliged to go to the White House, or to the War Department, or the Navy Department, or the R. F. C., or any other Government department or agency, and I did not have any gasoline in my car, and took a taxicab, it would require as much gasoline to take me there and back as it would if I were driving my own car.

Mr. President, I drive my own car. I have no chauffeur. I never have had one in my life. I cannot afford one, and the Government does not give me one, and I would not have one if it did. I drive my own car and I enjoy driving it. I park it myself. Last night I was on my way to my office to transact some public business, and I found my gasoline tank empty. I drove into a gasoline station to buy some gas, and those in charge there would not let me have any. I then drove to another gasoline station, and the attendant there would not let me have any. I finally turned back and drove home and parked my car for the night, and this morning I went to a gasoline station where I could obtain only 2 gallons, and that amount of gasoline took me to my office and will carry me home tonight.

Mr. President, we are denounced as a lot of unworthy men, men who cannot be believed; who cannot be trusted even to administer the gas card honestly. That is because some newspaper in Washington started another campaign to undermine the faith at least of the people in the District of Columbia, if not in our States, in the Congress of the United States. That is going on all the time. So far as I am concerned, I do not propose to be cowed by it. I do not propose to be intimidated by it. I do not propose to apologize to anyone in

Washington or elsewhere if I this afternoon take an X card and sign my name on the pledge not to misuse it. If I have to be "resolved" into honesty here I do not want to stay here any longer, and I do not think any of us ought to. Our constituents ought to send some honest men here if we cannot be trusted to buy only the gasoline we need in the performance of our duties to the people who sent us here.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Does not the Senator think that if it is necessary for Congress to agree to a resolution pledging its Members to adhere to the understanding by which we obtained these cards, we also ought to include in the resolution a pledge by the Members of the Senate not to go out and hold up a train, or rob a bank, or commit any other offenses against public laws or public decency?

Mr. BARKLEY. There would be more reason for doing the latter, because the commission of such offenses is a violation of the law, and if any such thing were necessary we ought to obligate ourselves every day not to violate the law. What we have now before us, however, is a proposal to make us honest by a resolution with respect to a regulation governing the use of gas in the District of Columbia.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I shall be glad to yield to the Senator in a moment.

Mr. President, I have not had my car outside the District of Columbia since the 7th day of December, when I drove it back into Washington from my home in Kentucky. I have not had it beyond the boundaries of the District of Columbia in 5 months or more, and yet I use on the average of from 14 to 25 gallons of gasoline in the week riding around to the departments in Washington in the performance of my duty and in coming to and from my home to my office in the Senate Office Building.

I suppose it might be said that it is not the duty of Members of the Senate to go to the departments. There are some persons in this country who do not think Senators ought to go to the departments. A bill was introduced not long ago whose provisions would make it a felony not only for a Member of the Senate to go to a department but to call up one on the telephone to have some service performed for his constituents. Theoretically, it may be that Members of the Senate have no business except to legislate. But, Mr. President, the people in our States as a rule do not know anyone in Washington but their Senators and their Representatives, and the Government of the United States now of necessity is coming in closer contact with them in the transaction of their business and in their lives than ever before. Most of these people do not know to whom to write except to us. Of course, it does not do much good, because there is a feeling abroad in the

District of Columbia that if a Senator undertakes even to call up an executive officer and make a suggestion or a request, he is undertaking to handle the business of the executive department.

I have often advised my constituents—by and large I think it may be true—that the effort of a Senator or Representative to aid his constituents frequently does more harm than good. It is difficult to convince our constituents of that; and we must go ahead and make the effort. They do not know anybody in Washington except their Senators or Representatives. They have no lobby. They cannot hire lawyers to come here.

When one of my constituents writes me a letter calling attention to priorities or any other subject which may be under consideration by any of the executive departments, I not only take it to be my duty to render such assistance as I can but I find pleasure in doing so. Frequently I can do it over the telephone; but often I have to go downtown. I go in my own car. I drive it and park it myself. If I should leave it over at the Senate Office Building or at home, and take a taxicab, would I be saving any gasoline? Would the Government be saving any gasoline? Would the people be saving any gasoline?

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield to the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. McFARLAND. Does the Senator think it would please the enemy to see Congress undermined by this process or any other process?

Mr. BARKLEY. It would please a great many of our enemies here at home.

Mr. McFARLAND. How about the enemies abroad?

Mr. BARKLEY. It would not displease them. However, I am concerned at the moment with some of our enemies right here. In good time we shall attend to our foreign enemies.

I am not willing, by anything I say or do, or by any vote I cast as a Senator, to announce to the people of the United States that I am unworthy, or that any other Senator is unworthy of belief or credit, or that he cannot be trusted to conserve gasoline or anything else which it is necessary to conserve in order to win this war.

I am sorry that my good friend from California seems to think it is necessary to adopt a resolution of this sort in order that we may get headlines in the newspapers as big as the headlines of yesterday denouncing us. If the only business of the United States Senate is to compete in the size of "boxcar" letters in headlines, we ought to quit. In the first place, we cannot do it. We have no newspapers. I am willing to bet my head against a hole in a doughnut that what I am now saying will get no headlines in the newspapers. [Laughter.] I am not interested in headlines. I am not going to vote here because there have been headlines or because there have been no headlines. I shall vote here according to my conscience and according to what I believe to be the proprieties. I will not

vote to denounce the United States Senate or the House of Representatives because their Members are classified as Federal officials, as more than 6,000 others have been classified, not by us, but by the agency which is administering the law.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. DOWNEY. In one respect I feel that the distinguished Senator has failed to comprehend certain language in the resolution.

Mr. BARKLEY. I shall read it.

Mr. DOWNEY. The language of the resolution applies to all public officials—not the part, of course, in which the Senate pledges itself to be bound by the common rule but the statement that all public officials should be bound by the same rule as the rest of the Nation. Consequently, the resolution is a statement referring to millions of public officials. If the distinguished Senator has not the vision to foresee what gasoline rationing and rubber rationing will bring forth in 60 or 90 days, he will see it at the end of that time, when millions of public officials in villages, cities, counties, and States are turned loose with X cards entitling them to unlimited amounts of gasoline when their neighbors are held to a minimum amount, or to none at all.

I believe that the Senate could afford to set aside for one moment its dignity, and the question of whether or not its honor has been impugned, and put itself on record in a statement of policy to all other public officials and to the people of this Nation that we shall be bound by the rule of need, and will match the rest of the country, sacrifice for sacrifice, hardship for hardship. If that is calling upon the Senate for something which is dishonorable and self-contemptuous, I would regret what I am doing. But I cannot see it that way.

Mr. BARKLEY. I appreciate the sincerity of the Senator. It may be that I do not have as much vision as I ought to have; but if I can see far enough ahead of me to visualize the time when it will be necessary for all those who are receiving X cards—and I am not speaking of Senators and Representatives, but taxicab drivers and everybody else—to be put on a stricter ration, or even required to walk, I shall join that caravan or parade with as much grace, resignation—and I hope dignity—as is possible under the circumstances.

However, the Senator's resolution has no effect on other public officials. It has not the effect of law on anybody. It is a declaration of policy. After some "whereases" the resolution states:

*Resolved*, That it is the sense of the Senate that the Members thereof shall collectively and individually waive any special rights, privileges, or exemptions they may be accorded under the terms of any gasoline rationing order, and shall consider themselves bound by honor to the acceptance of the rationing restrictions which are of general application.

Certainly that resolution has no application to anybody except Senators. It does not ask anybody except Senators to

do anything. It asks us, as Senators, to declare it to be the sense of the Senate to waive any special rights. Are we enjoying any special rights, privileges, or exemptions?

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. DOWNEY. If the Senator will read the prior portion of the resolution, he will see a general statement of the opinion of the Senate that all officials should be judged by the one standard, that of need.

Mr. BARKLEY. The "whereases" have nothing to do with the resolving part. The "whereases" might talk about anything. Usually the "whereases" are a stump speech. It is the resolving clauses which carry the weight, if any.

Mr. President, I do not wish to occupy the time of the Senate. I am opposed to the resolution. If the Senate is to consider it, I shall vote against it. I wished to express a few of the views which I entertain with respect to this contemptuous and contemptible attitude and effort on the part of many persons to make it appear that Members of the Senate have to be watched, and chained like thieves in order that they will not waste gasoline under a card to which they may be entitled as officials, and prove unworthy of the great cause which has been entrusted to our keeping.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. DANAHER. I hold in my hand a clipping from the final edition of last night's Evening Star. I read:

Senator DOWNEY showed newspapermen a copy of the resolution he plans to introduce tomorrow. It stated that "need, and need alone" is the only just basis of rationing and that "the privileged exemption of Government officials from restrictions applying to the people is a violation of democratic principle."

"Now, therefore," the resolution concluded, "be it understood as the sense of the Senate that the Members of this body shall collectively and individually waive any special rights, perquisites, or exemptions they may be accorded under the terms of any rationing order, and shall consider themselves bound by honor to the acceptance of the common rule."

Does not the Senator from Kentucky realize, without pursuing this subject further, why this resolution was shown to newspaper men? Does the Senator from Kentucky think that the Senator from California merely met the newspapermen in the hall somewhere, whipped out this resolution, and said, "This is what I am going to do tomorrow"? Does the Senator suppose for 1 minute that we ought not properly to amend the resolution and declare that it is the sense of the Senate that we seriously and sincerely deprecate any effort, in a cheap demagogic political fashion, to capitalize at the expense of other Members of this body?

Mr. BARKLEY. So far as I am concerned, I think probably we might as well take up the resolution and vote on it and get rid of it one way or the other. If the Senate wishes to adopt such a resolution, I should like to know it as soon as



possible. If it does not wish to adopt it, I think the country ought to know that for once in our history we are not to be driven into a brush pile merely because we hear some howling going on; that we are not to be driven under the porch because we fear to come out and meet our fate. I am willing to meet mine right now on the floor.

Let me say that if the resolution is taken up it will be subject to amendment. Any Senator may offer any amendment he desires in an effort to approach the stupidity of the original document.

Mr. DANAHER. Which, of course, is inane.

Let me say to the Senator from Kentucky that on Wednesday last a very considerable number of us in the Senate were interested in the attempt to get gasoline and fuel oil into the 17 rationed States. We sought to open up the inland and coastal waterways to barge transportation so as to carry fuel oil and gasoline to the States which are so badly in need of them.

While we were pursuing that endeavor, and the Senate was adopting an amendment to try to get gasoline into those States, the Senator from California was not present. That is his business. He has a perfect right to be absent for any reason. No doubt he was absent on important public business; but we were here trying to get gasoline into those States.

Mr. BARKLEY. I appreciate the Senator's contribution. He always contributes to every debate which he deigns to adorn with his remarks. I am glad to have the benefit of his views, particularly at this time.

Mr. DANAHER. They substantially coincide with those of the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. Substantially; with the accent on "substantially."

Mr. President, I have no desire to consume further time—

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield to the Senator. I am willing to vote now.

Mr. DOWNEY. I appreciate the courtesy of the distinguished Senator from Kentucky.

The Senator from Connecticut made some remarks about a Senator who gives out a press release concerning a bill or resolution which he intends to introduce in the Senate. It is my custom to do so. The Senator from Connecticut seems to think that such a course is prejudicial and an extraordinary violation of something. If the distinguished Senator from Kentucky desires to amend this resolution to declare that I am a demagogue in suggesting that the Senate should declare its policy, I invite him to do so and to submit his case to the people of his State and of the Nation. I believe I know something about what is going to happen to Connecticut people and Connecticut industry within the next 6 months. If the Senator is so affronted by the fact that I seek to increase the morale of the American people in this respect, I have no objection to his submitting to the Senate an amendment to the resolution. I shall be happy to have him do so.

Mr. BARKLEY. I had no thought of offering an amendment.

Mr. DOWNEY. I referred to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BARKLEY. I had no thought of offering an amendment declaring the Senator a demagogue. I had not thought of submitting such a resolution any more than I had thought of submitting one declaring that I am an honorable man. [Laughter.]

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. DOWNEY. I might state to the distinguished Senator from Kentucky that my remarks were not in reference to him.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator said, "The Senator from Kentucky."

Mr. DOWNEY. I beg the Senator's pardon. I meant the Senator from Connecticut. Taking the implication of his remarks as they now appear in the RECORD, I invite the distinguished Senator, if he desires to do so, to submit to the Senate the type of amendment which he has suggested, and see whether or not it will meet with the approval of the people of his State and of this Nation.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, having expressed myself, I do not care to occupy the floor any longer. I shall not have any objection to a vote, if it can be had at once, on the resolution of the Senator. I hope we may vote on it today.

Mr. BARKLEY subsequently said: Mr. President, I intended in my remarks a while ago to read a statement issued by the Price Administrator. I ask that it appear at the end of my remarks, and I should like to read it now for the information of the Senate. It is as follows:

Section 1394.32 of the Emergency Gasoline Rationing Regulations authorizes the issuance of a class X card if all or substantially all of the use of the vehicle in question is certified by the applicant to be for the official business of a Federal, State, local, or foreign Government or Government agency.

A car is deemed used for official business to the extent that it is actually driven on Government business in carrying out the functions of the particular agency or office. In my opinion the use of a private car by a Member of Congress or any other Federal or State employee in order to transact business with a Government agency is official business.

That is the Price Administrator speaking, and he has issued this statement in response to the attacks which were carried in the newspapers with respect to the use of these cards.

Use of a car by any Federal or State employee for driving to and from his work entitles such person to an appropriate A or B card, and if necessary he may file an application with his local board for a supplementary ration. Such use is not official business. But if a person is otherwise eligible for an X card he may use that card for gasoline necessary to get to and from work.

Persons who have received an X card under an erroneous or mistaken interpretation of the intent of the regulation may return the X card to any registration place and apply for a card of the proper class.

I am relying on the good faith and patriotism of those who hold X cards to see to it that the privilege is not abused for private use.

That is the statement issued by the Price Administrator. I ask that it be made a part of my remarks and appear at the end thereof before the Senator from Wisconsin began his statement. It is an interpretation of the regulation which is made and applies not only to us but to thousands of Federal, State, local, county, and city officers all over the United States.

I reiterate what I said and agree with what the Senator from Wisconsin has said, that it would seem to be incredible that the United States should select itself for condemnation by exercising the right accorded to its members by an administrative agency.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, the Senator from Kentucky has covered this subject very fully. I do not wish to speak at any length, but I do desire to take this opportunity to make a few observations in connection with what seems to me a deliberate campaign that is being carried on in certain sections of the press of this country to undermine the faith of the people in their elected representatives in the Congress of the United States. Of course, I do not charge that the Senator from California is a part of that campaign; but I have observed, Mr. President, not only on this occasion, but recently on the occasion when the Congress voted the privilege of entering the annuity system to Members of Congress, along with other officials, that a similar campaign was taken up and carried on all over the country.

I, of course, would be the first to rush to the defense of any person or any organization or any publication that desired to criticize any Member of Congress or any group of Members of Congress or the Congress itself for any position which might be taken on a public question. That is the essence of democracy. However, Mr. President, no one can study the type of articles which have been printed and the type of editorials which have been employed in connection with these attacks upon Congress and its membership without coming to the conclusion that they are calculated not to oppose the stand of Congress or of any individuals in Congress upon public questions, but rather to undermine the faith of the people in the integrity and the character of the men who occupy positions in this body, and the one at the other end of the Capitol.

Mr. President, if you will study the trend of the decline of democracy in this recent period of time you will find that one of the first things which has been attempted in each one of the cases in which dictatorship has come into power has been the undermining of the faith of the people in the integrity and the responsibility and the statesmanship and the capacity of men who have represented them in legislative bodies.

I only want to utter a few words of warning to the press of the United States. I wish to warn the press that if their right to criticize Members of Congress, if their right to exercise the privileges, guaranteed by the Constitution, of full

and free expression of what they believe in and stand for, ever comes into question in this country, the only place in which it will find adequate defense will be in the halls of the legislative branch of the Government; for, inherently, there grows with executive power a desire to suppress criticism, even though it be legitimate. I speak, of course, impersonally; but I say that the Congress has already been forced by the circumstance of war to surrender to the Chief Executive of the United States powers which are not wielded by another individual on this earth.

I repeat, it has been necessary by the force of circumstance of total war that the legislative branch of government should divest itself of these powers. True, we have tried to safeguard them in most instances by providing that they shall exist only for the duration of the war; but let us not forget, Mr. President—and I hope I will not be misunderstood, but I say it just the same—that in the last analysis war is the enemy of democracy, for it requires a democratic government to yield the powers which are lodged in the representatives of the people—in Congress—and to vest them in the Executive in order that he may carry on war.

There is not a person who has studied the history of the United States who does not know that in each and every war in which we have been engaged there has been a necessity for greater and greater concentration of power in the hands of the Executive; and following each of the past wars in which we have been engaged the powers yielded have never been entirely retaken by the Congress. If there were to be drawn a chart showing the concentration of power in the hands of the Executive from the beginning of the history of this country down to now, there would be disclosed upon the chart a constantly rising curve, which would be found to rise abruptly at each period when the Nation engaged in war and to fail to recede entirely thereafter.

So I say, Mr. President, that in considering matters of this kind we are not concerned with ourselves as individuals, but we do represent, we do hold, however unworthily, the power delegated to us by the founding fathers as the present wielders of the legislative power of government. Unless we have the courage to resist, unless we have the courage to withstand these attacks which are made upon the legislative branch of the Government, I say that in the end the vision about which the Senator from California talked will demonstrate ultimately that we have been derelict in our duty and have contributed to the decline, if not to the fall, of republican government in the United States of America.

Mr. President, I resent this resolution on another score. I think it impugns the motives of every Member of the United States Senate. I assume, of course, that the Senator from California did not so intend; but I say that one cannot read this resolution without coming to the conclusion that if it is adopted the Senate of the United States will have

taken legislative action to declare that the individual Members of this body are not to be trusted as are the other 5,800 officials in the city of Washington to carry out the pledge to which they signed their names when these cards were issued.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. DOWNEY. Let me say to the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin, for whom I have high admiration and deep affection, that I think he does with gross unfairness interpret the meaning of that resolution. The effect of agreeing to the resolution would be to declare the policy of the Senate of the United States in this rationing of gasoline to be that we shall be bound by the same rules and sacrifices as those by which the rest of the Nation is bound. That is all that resolution would do. If that impugns the honor of the Senate, if that in any way strikes at democracy, I fail to see it.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Was not the policy of the Senate of the United States and of Congress declared at the time each individual Senator took his oath of office?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I assume that to be true. I do not wish to do the Senator from California an injustice, and, at the risk of being repetitious, I shall read again the resolving clause of his resolution, which, after all, is the only important part of it, for usually "whereases" to a resolution are not even agreed to when the resolution is adopted:

*Resolved*, That it is the sense of the Senate that the Members thereof shall collectively and individually waive any special rights, privileges, or exemptions they may be accorded under the terms of any gasoline rationing order, and shall consider themselves bound by honor to the acceptance of the rationing restrictions which are of general application.

Mr. President, I cannot read this language and come to any other conclusion than that, if we adopt the resolution, we will have taken legislative action to declare that we, as a body, are not to be trusted to carry out the individual agreements which we made at the time we signed applications for ration cards.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. What is the effect of it? If a Senator who has signed one of the X cards cannot be trusted with his original pledge, why should he be trusted when he "resolves" that he meant what he said when he signed his card?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I cannot answer that question; I find it impossible to answer it. The Senator's question is an argument for the resolution being voted down.

Mr. President, I should like to say a further word. I know the Members of this body, I think, pretty well. As a group of men, I am proud to be associated with them. The Senators from any given

State will stand high compared to any two men in their State, selected from any group of bankers or manufacturers, any group of laboring men, any group of farmers or any group of people from any walk of life. I have said on previous occasions, and I now repeat, that it has been my observation that the Members of this body, as a group, are as hard a working body of men as I know of in the United States. I know they are patriotic, and I know that if the time comes when it is necessary to help the war effort even by one iota the Members of the Senate will be in the forefront of those who insist that they shall make personal sacrifices to that end. I do not question that every man in this body would be delighted to lay down his life at this hour if he thought his country could thereby attain a victory in this war.

Mr. President, when there are 5,700 other officials in this community who, by order of the man charged with the responsibility of administering this law are to receive these cards and are to be trusted to utilize them only for the transaction of essential business, I say that it would be a shame and a disgrace for the Senate of the United States to befoul its own nest by adopting such a resolution as has been proposed.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. The 5,800 applied only to the first day's registration. It did not include today's. We will not know finally the number of those who receive X cards until the registration has been completed. The number I gave awhile ago represented only the first day's registration.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. The number is sufficient to prove the point. I wish to say that, as the impact of the orders of the very gentleman who issued this regulation begin to strangle the normal activities of life all over the United States, it will become more and more important daily for Senators and Representatives to be in such a position that they can efficiently and quickly present the legitimate cases, the legitimate arguments which are to be made in behalf of their constituents.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I should like to suggest to the Senator that the war may be a long one and that concentration of power will become more and more necessary, as will the need for sacrifice. I can think of no better guaranty for the survival of democracy and for the elimination of a voluntary dictatorship, which is necessary in war, than to have the legislative branch given all the means of communication and transportation which its members can be afforded, so that they may keep in constant touch with the people at election and other times and keep them informed.

We must not lose sight of the fact that there are numerous propaganda agencies set up as a part of this war effort which are continually flooding the electorate



with all kinds of information, and I think it would be a serious matter if the legislative branch, made up of only elected representatives, except for the President and the Vice President, were denied every facility to visit and talk to their people, to talk to them in Rotary Clubs and Lions Clubs and chambers of commerce and workmen's organizations and farm organizations, in order to keep the light of democracy burning and continually to put the people on guard against giving up more than is necessary. Although we will quickly give up all that is necessary, we must recapture it instantly when the circumstances warrant its recapture. No greater evil, in my judgment, could befall this country than that the prerogatives of the legislative branch should be curtailed. That would make us like the Reichstag, like the Japanese Parliament, like Mussolini's rubber-stamp assembly in Italy. We want this representative Government to function and, even though it may be dormant as to many of its legislative rights, we want to be in a position to exercise them with full vigor whenever occasion and opportunity demand that they shall be so exercised.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I appreciate the contribution of the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. President, as I view it, the adoption of the pending resolution will be tantamount to the Senate admitting by legislative action that the word of its individual Members is not good.

Mr. BARKLEY. I agree to that interpretation, and I think that would be the effect.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Of course, the point is that if our individual word is not good, our collective word is not good.

Mr. BARKLEY. No; because our collective word is spread out thinner than our individual word.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Exactly.

Mr. BARKLEY. When we sign a pledge to do a certain thing and then adopt a resolution saying we will do the same thing, the effect is to divide it by 96, whereas my signature is divided only by 1.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SMATHERS in the chair). Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Of course, I agree wholeheartedly with everything the Senator from Kentucky and the Senator from Wisconsin have said. So far as the statement of Price Administrator Henderson, which we all received this morning, is concerned, it seems to me to be an unexceptionable declaration of policy, but I should like to call the Senator's attention to the fact that in yesterday's morning newspapers some anonymous understrapper, who was afraid or ashamed to give his name but was designated as the official spokesman of the Office of Price Administration, stated that Senators were not performing official business when they visited departments and bureaus of the Government, that they were not engaged in official

business when they went to the departments to talk about legislation or to talk about the interests of their constituents.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I shall yield in a moment. Mr. Henderson does not repudiate that statement directly in his statement, as it seems to me he ought to do. It appears to me to be a very dangerous development in the history of this Government, Mr. President, if some anonymous whippersnapper in one of the Government bureaus or departments can define the official duties of the Congress of the United States. Every Member of this body, when he stood at the rostrum and took the oath of office, took an oath that he would well and faithfully perform the duties of the office upon which he was about to enter. I say that it is not the function of some underling in any Government bureau to undertake to define the duties and official business of the Congress of the United States, and such a thing should not be tolerated.

Mr. BARKLEY. I merely desired to ask the Senator from Missouri, as well as the Senator from Wisconsin, if the Senator from Missouri or I should go down to call upon this anonymous individual—I do not know whether he is a whippersnapper or not—

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I judge he is, from his statement. I do not know who he is, but I judge from his statement that he is a whippersnapper.

Mr. BARKLEY. There may be other descriptions which might be even more appropriate.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Yes; which probably should not be used in debate on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. BARKLEY. He is anonymous, at least so far as we know. Suppose the Senator from Missouri or I or any other Senator should go down to see him about some matter pertaining to his department, would he say that was official, or would he regard it as a personal, social call?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Let me say to the Senator from Kentucky that if the Senator from Kentucky or the Senator from Wisconsin or I myself went down to talk to this whippersnapper, or understrapper, or whatever he may be, about the business of his office, we would pay for our own gasoline and use our own cars, and that would not, according to him, be official business. But if he should come to the Capitol to appear before a Senate committee, or to talk to the Senator from Kentucky or the Senator from Wisconsin or to me in the interest of an appropriation, or some legislative proposal which he wanted to slip into a bill, he would ride in an official car, the Government would pay for his gasoline, and that would be official business; and he probably would have a chauffeur paid by the Government. [Laughter.]

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I wish to conclude with one final statement. I believe the people of this country are more dependent today upon the services of their Representatives in Congress, and their United States Senators,

than at any other time in the history of the Republic. It is due to the fact that we are engaged in a total war, and total war affects the lives of every man, woman, and child in this country. The only people in Washington outside the President of the United States and the members of his Cabinet, and a few others in high official position, whom the people know, are their Representatives in the House of Representatives and the Members of the United States Senate. To whom are they to turn if they desire to have their cause properly presented, unless they turn to their Senators or to their Representatives?

Having recently been in Wisconsin, I do not hesitate to say that the people of this country are concerned with regard to the war as they never have been before. Let no Member of this body, or any other person, get the impression that the people of this country are complacent about the war. They are not. Their flesh and blood is involved in the war, and they bitterly resent any imputation from Washington, by officials or others, that they are not sufficiently concerned about the war.

Mr. President, the people are determined to win the war and they are willing to make whatever sacrifices are necessary to that end, but they want more than ever that their Representatives in Congress should be in a position to discharge in an efficient manner their responsibilities as representatives of the people.

Mr. President, I hope the resolution will be voted down by an overwhelming majority.

Mr. GILLETTE. Before the Senator takes his seat, I wonder if he will yield to me momentarily in connection with the general picture he has been discussing, and the very clear statement of the picture as presented by the majority leader?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. GILLETTE. I think it would be illuminating, in discussing the very apparent purpose to discredit the Congress of the United States in the minds of the people, and to destroy the confidence of the people in their governmental agencies, to direct attention to the current issue of Fortune magazine, in which appears an unsigned article entitled "The Case Against the Seventy-seventh Congress."

I take the time to quote just two statements from the article:

Is there a statesman in the House—or Senate? Here are the facts. \* \* \* It is true that for collective brains, guts, vision, and leadership the Seventy-seventh would stand pretty close to the bottom in any ranking of the seventy-seven Congresses that have assembled biennially since 1789. \* \* \* It is true that, along with a number of able, patriotic, hard-working legislators, this Congress contains an overflowing measure of hacks, demagogues, and timeservers.

The same article proceeds to name some of the Members of Congress, casting aspersions on them, not only collectively but individually.

I wish to ask the Senator whether he can conceive of any greater disservice to this Nation, at a time when it needs

the support of every citizen, than destroying the confidence of the American people, or attempting to destroy it, in the agencies which are carrying on representative government.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I would defend with my last breath the right of the magazine quoted by the Senator or any other publication in the United States to classify me, as an individual, in any manner they saw fit, but when they attempt to classify Congress as a whole, and when they make statements that give the people the impression that Congress is not worthy of the confidence of the people of this country, they are helping to undermine democratic government, and they are playing into the hands of those who are opposed to democracy, both at home and abroad.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Wisconsin a question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield for a further question?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I am in full accord with what the Senator has said, and I should like to ask him whether he does not think it would be a good idea, and a valid exercise of his duty, for the Attorney General to ask a Federal grand jury to investigate newspapers, columnists, and others who are trying to destroy the confidence of the people in any branch of the Government, on the ground that it is seditious conduct, and should be brought to the attention of the court.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, that is a question I should not wish to answer offhand. I am assuming, of course, that the Department of Justice will enforce the law and protect the Government against any activity aimed at it. On the other hand, I am so jealous of the essential prerogatives and rights and privileges which go with the democratic form of government that I would rather suffer all sorts of condemnation and calumny, so far as I am concerned as an individual, than to have the engine of the law utilized to suppress the right of free speech, freedom of assembly, freedom of the press, or freedom of religion. Therefore, I say that the question is not one which I should care to answer offhand; but I feel that I am within my rights, and I am not in any way impinging upon those sacred privileges when I issue a solemn word of warning to those who are indulging in this campaign to destroy the faith of the people in Congress, that they are destroying, or helping to destroy the only branch of government which, in the last analysis, will go down fighting, if need be, for the fundamental freedoms guaranteed by the Constitution.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] for their remarks. I wish to say at the outset that I should be opposed to any effort such as that suggested by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD]. If the Senate of the United States and the Congress of the country cannot protect themselves, if we have to have the Department of Justice,

or any other department of the executive branch of the Government, take care of us, then we are in a bad way.

I am opposed to the resolution of the Senator from California, and I shall vote against it. I believe in the Constitution of the United States. I believe in the laws of the country which are passed by the Congress of the United States, even those measures which have become law without my vote. If a law is once placed on the statute books, I believe in that law.

I have been elected to the Congress by the people of the State of New Mexico and not by newspapermen in the city of Washington or elsewhere, and my responsibility is only to the people of New Mexico. I took my oath of office, and I meant it, swearing that I would respect and obey the Constitution and that I would obey the laws of the country without any reservation whatsoever.

That is exactly my position in this body today. Under my oath as a Member of the Senate what I resolve has nothing whatsoever to do with the case. It is not possible to make a man honest by resolution. It is not possible to make a man an American by resolution, or to make a man patriotic by resolution. He either is patriotic or he is not patriotic. We take it for granted that when a Senator-elect walks up to the rostrum of the Senate and signs his name, after taking the oath of office, he knows what he is doing and means faithfully to fulfill his promise. What I promised when I took my oath is the only pledge I wish to give the people of this country.

The newspaper boys have their good times. After all, they have to make a living, and they write anything which they think may interest people, sometimes even those with perverted minds. But if they have reached the point, in writing about Congress, when what they write affects the dignity of the Congress and the faith of the American public in the Congress, in my opinion, and in my opinion only, I think it is possibly our fault, in that perhaps we do not take our oaths of office with sufficient seriousness and respect.

Many a time when we knew we were right in taking a certain position, some newspaper said, "Boo," and we took it for granted that the newspaper was representing the public. After all, the article which appears in a newspaper is written by an individual. There is a vast difference between public opinion and editorial or newspaper opinion. Any Senator can sit down with a typewriter before him and write his opinion on a subject. That is an individual opinion. The average reporter in the press gallery, trying to do the best he can, after listening to debate in the Senate sits down and with his typewriter writes out a story for his newspaper. Does that story represent even the opinion of the people of the city of Washington? No, Mr. President, it represents only the individual thoughts and ideas of the man who wrote the story after listening to the debate in the Senate. Such individual thoughts and ideas do not necessarily represent public

opinion. Simply because an article appears in the Washington Post, or the Star, or the Times-Herald, or the News, does not mean that it represents the views of the people of the city of Washington. It represents, as I have said, the views of the individual newspaper boy in the Senate press gallery. He might have meant what he wrote, he might have written his article in good faith, but it does not necessarily represent public opinion.

Mr. President, during my public life I have had some experience with newspapers. During my last election campaign, which was a tough one, there were two country weeklies on my side. I venture to say that one of those weeklies did not have more than 250 subscribers, and the other one possibly 400 subscribers. The so-called press, with its great prestige, one representative thereof being a newspaper which could afford a 50,000-kilocycle radio station, was against me. But I was elected. That is why I venture to say that the press does not represent public opinion, because public opinion is the collective opinion of the people as a whole.

Mr. President, who write the editorials for the New York Times, or for the New York Herald Tribune, or for the local newspapers? Individuals write the editorials. The writer of an editorial has certain ideas, and, God bless him, under our laws, he may express his ideas freely. Whether he condemns Congress or praises Congress, we would fight to preserve his right to express his opinion. But we seem to take it for granted that the whole world is against us when one or more newspapers say "boo" to us, and we become frightened. Such things do not scare me. I sometimes wish newspaper men would say to me individually what they say about me collectively, but they do not do so.

Until we stand up as Senators of the United States and do our duty, irrespective of what any newspaper may say, we are going to lose face. I shall vote against the resolution.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, I wish to take only 2 or 3 more minutes of the time of the Senate, and I shall discuss my own case because it is personal to me. While the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] has disclaimed any intention of offering criticism by the article which appeared in the press and by discussion of his projected resolution in advance of its coming here, the fact remains that it did constitute criticism, that it was on the air, that it was in the mouths of many commentators, that it was discussed in various newspapers in the country, and so it is an inevitable result of the action taken by the Senator from California that that particular criticism took the form and the direction and the extent it did.

Mr. President, take my case. I live 9 miles from the Capitol. I do not live on a bus line. It takes approximately an hour and a half to come here by bus, with three changes. On the other hand, I live only 3 miles from the Silver Spring Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Station. So I bought a commutation ticket that my



wife may take me by automobile over that 3 miles and I can ride in on the train on the days when I may not otherwise need a car, even though Mr. Henderson's rationing order expressly stated that if a person is otherwise eligible for an X card he may use that card for gasoline necessary to take him to and from his work.

But, Mr. President, when an engineer in Connecticut of vast experience believes that he can render patriotic service to the Government and to the Marine Corps, and it becomes essential that I drive from the Chevy Chase line all the way across to Arlington on the Columbia Pike and discuss the matter with a Marine officer there in charge, in order to ascertain whether the qualifications of the particular applicant meet the requirements of the Marine Corps, I consider that to be public business; so would the Marine Corps officer with whom I talked.

Then, Mr. President, when I go to the W. P. B., as I have on many occasions, I go there on public business. To illustrate, recently I went there about a cutlery concern which has been some 60 years in existence, employing 150 or 160 trained and skilled men. They cannot get steel with which to continue their business. The men are to be forced out of work. They did not have the kind of machinery which is readily convertible to war production perhaps, and it became essential that we ascertain on what basis we might put that plant to the most effective use for the Government of the United States. It required a conference, and that was official business.

I had occasion to go down to the W. P. B. in another instance with reference to a corporation which is engaged in moving machinery for defense industries. That corporation serves the navy yards, it serves the Quonset Point torpedo station, it serves various of the New England arsenals and defense industries. I sought a priority rating for a power crane, but the net result, Mr. President, in connection with all my activities in such behalf is that many, many hours were spent and driving was an essential.

In those instances—and I am simply giving a few assorted and typical illustrations of the kind of official use to which Members of the Senate put their cars—I submit that that is an essential, necessary, and proper use of the automobile of an individual Senator. Consequently I need the car, but I will ration myself down to the bare bone. I am prepared to show day by day what mileage I get and how much gasoline it takes to accomplish the necessary business. I will conserve in every proper way, and so will every other Senator. Every right thinking, honorable Member of this body will naturally expect and know that his colleagues will follow that course.

Mr. President, it is on that account that I dislike the criticism, and have said so publicly, and say so now. I shall vote against the resolution.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I shall impose upon the Senate for only 2 or 3 minutes longer. When this rationing order went into effect it became apparent that millions of our people on the Atlantic

seaboard would be forced into unemployment and bankruptcy. Tens of millions of people will have to submit themselves to extraordinary sacrifices and unhappy deprivation. The Members of the Senate of the United States may say what they desire here. Nevertheless, today in every hamlet, grocery store, crossroads, village, town, and city on the Atlantic seaboard the people are wondering in their own minds, "Will public officials submit to the same regulation as the rest of us?" They do not realize what honorable gentlemen we are. In the dark and unhappy days ahead tens of millions of our people will be questioning what we and other public officials will do.

When I submitted this resolution I could not conceive that the Members of this body would think that it impugned their honor or was an insult to their honesty. I thought every Member would want to declare to people who must suffer great hardship, that, whatever comes, we Senators will abide by the common rule and make the common sacrifice. I know that such a declaration would have increased the esprit de corps and morale of this Nation. But Members of the Senate say that a simple declaration to our people that, "In the dark days which lie ahead your sacrifices will be ours, your rules will be ours," impugns the honor of this great body.

Mr. President, I do not conceive that to be the effect of the resolution. I thought that every Senator would be glad to have the opportunity solemnly to declare by a resolution, as a matter of public policy, what we, the leaders of the Nation, would be doing here in Washington when bankruptcy and unemployment and deprivation cut into the ranks of our people in the coming months.

I merely wish to assure the Senate that I had no intention of impugning the honor of anyone, or of arraigning the Senate. I thought I was proposing something that every Member would want to do. But under the manifest sentiment of this body there remains nothing, so far as I am concerned, except to submit the resolution and to allow it to be voted upon.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, the unanimous-consent request for consideration of the resolution has not yet been granted, has it?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BUNKER in the chair). It has not.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, I wish to make a brief statement. I do not believe we can decide this question by a resolution. Personally, I did not ask for a ration card, and did not receive any, because I did not want any. I walk from the hotel to the Capitol and back every day. If it is raining I ride in a taxicab. However, I do not wish, by a resolution, to undertake to impugn the motives or honesty of any Member of the Senate, because I do not believe the people have any right to assume that we are less anxious than anyone else to make every reasonable sacrifice necessary to victory in this war.

I dislike to see articles by commentators who frequently hold up Congress to ridicule. I read one recently which stated that there was no Clay or Webster here, and nobody who could compare with statesmen which the country has produced in the past. CARTER GLASS is here; and there are many others here who have made just as good a record as was made in the past by anyone of whom we can think. It is always easy to make a great man out of somebody after he is dead. We always have a tendency to undervalue, underestimate, and depreciate the living. That is something which does not contribute to good will, or to the welfare of the country. It is open season on men in public office. I have spent most of my life in public office. I am not very old; but I have learned that the people have a right to call us whatever they wish to call us, and that we ought not to bother about it. We ought to expect it, and not become angry about it.

Mr. President, I will not vote for the resolution of the Senator from California for the reason that I do not believe a single Member of the Senate would abuse the little privileges which are accorded him under the rationing system. I know that Members of Congress need their cars, and need gasoline, and that their constituents expect them to represent them on important matters before the various boards, bureaus, and commissions.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHANDLER. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I think the Senator has used the wrong word. There is not a single privilege involved. On the contrary, there is an unlimited obligation to use the supplies for nothing except official business. In other words, an X card is more restrictive than the other cards.

Mr. CHANDLER. I agree with the Senator from Michigan. The words he has chosen are better than the ones I have used.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Provided that the man who signs the card is a man of honor. If he is not a man of honor, and if it is not enough for him to make a pledge over his own signature, it certainly is not enough to adopt this resolution once. It ought to be read every morning immediately following the prayer.

Mr. CHANDLER. I join in the expression of the Senator from Michigan. I have respect for the honor and integrity of Members of the Senate. I do not believe they would abuse their privileges. I know that the people in other States have had experiences similar to those which my people have had. One hundred and four boys from my immediate neighborhood were trapped at Bataan or Corregidor. I do not know what fate has befallen them. They are either dead or captured. In Harrodsburg, the oldest town in Kentucky, there is hardly a home which does not mourn for a son, a brother, a father, an uncle, a nephew, or a cousin. It is unthinkable to me, when

sacrifices of blood, tears, and deprivation are common all over the country, that any man would cheat on 25 or 30 gallons of gasoline.

I am not willing to say by my vote that I think that Members of Congress would do so, because I do not think so. I think just the opposite. I believe that every Senator will realize how valuable is this treasure of ours, and how important it is that it be saved to provide materials and implements of war for a speedy and final victory for the United Nations in this great conflict.

I am sorry that my friend from California believes that this is the way to handle this matter. I know he is sincere. I shall join other Members of the Senate in voting against the resolution, because I wish to express the confidence which I feel in Members of the Senate on both sides of the aisle. I think they are entitled to that confidence, not only from their fellow Senators but from the people of the country.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, the resolution would not change the standing of any Senator who may have applied for a different kind of card than that to which he is entitled. It would have no legal effect. I cannot see that it would have any other effect. As I understand, an applicant for a card signs an application for whatever class of card he desires, except possibly in the case of the A cards. His signature is on the application. He states the circumstances under which he applies for the card. If we should adopt this resolution it would not change the procedure. It would not add to the responsibility of any applicant who signs an application blank.

It seems to me that the resolution reflects upon the membership of the Senate. Why should we adopt a resolution saying that we are to do something, when we know that it would have no legal effect? I do not believe we ought to waste time on the question. We have already spent nearly half of the day discussing this subject. The resolution is not yet before the Senate. I understand there is a unanimous-consent request for its present consideration. I rise to object to the request. I have no objection to referring the resolution to a committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from California, and the resolution will go over under the rule.

#### MEMORIAL ADDRESSES FOR DECEASED SENATORS

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I send to the desk a resolution, and I ask that it be read. I ask unanimous consent that it be immediately considered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read.

The Chief Clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 250), as follows:

*Resolved*, That on Monday, May 25, 1942, at the conclusion of the morning business, the legislative business of the Senate be suspended for the purpose of permitting the delivery of memorial addresses on the life, character, and public service of the late Senators Pat Harrison, of Mississippi; Andrew

Jackson Houston, of Texas; Alva M. Lumpkin, of South Carolina; and Alva B. Adams, of Colorado, respectively.

There being no objection, the resolution was considered and agreed to.

#### HOSPITAL FACILITIES OF THE ARMY— LETTER FROM LOWELL H. PATTERSON

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I have received a letter from Mr. Lowell H. Patterson, of Indianapolis, Ind., complimenting the hospital facilities of the United States Army. The letter is so entirely complimentary that I should like to place it in the RECORD. From time to time criticisms have been directed against various activities of the Army. For that reason it gives me pleasure to ask unanimous consent to have the letter printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF INDIANA,  
ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGE COMMISSION,  
Indianapolis, May 6, 1942.

Senator ROBERT R. REYNOLDS,  
Chairman, Military Affairs Committee,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Several months ago I had occasion to advise you how well our local induction center at Fort Harrison is being operated under the official management of Colonel Drysdale.

Since that time my son has been sent on to Fort Monmouth, N. J., where he has received his preliminary training in the Signal Corps, and then detailed for special work in what I believe is called the personnel division. Last week an injury developed in his knee and he has been placed in the Tilton General Hospital at Fort Dix under the direct supervision of Maj. A. Miller, chief of orthopedic section, but the hospital is under command of Col. S. J. Turnbull.

My son has advised me, particularly since he was home on a short furlough, of the efficient and competent way that Fort Monmouth is being operated from the viewpoint of a private. This morning comes a letter about the hospital at Fort Dix, and I think you should know just what he says, as he hasn't the slightest idea that I am writing to you.

In part: "The hospital is spick and span. Very neat and clean. The nurses and orderlies are very cooperative and decent. The food is the best I've had since I've been in the Army and is as good as any restaurant I have ever been in. We get fresh towels and linens and pajamas every day. Twice a day in the ward, at 11 a. m. and 3 p. m., milk is served (plain or chocolate). The library at the Red Cross is extensive and contains modern up-to-the-minute fiction, biography, etc., and is well planned. (Very few of the old books which have been in someone's attic for 20 years.) I hope you will check over our books and give any of mine to the Red Cross, as all are appreciated. Twice a week there are movies in the Red Cross. The P. X. is complete and has full services for all."

There is nothing that I want now or shall be wanting from your office, so there is no ulterior motive in my giving you this information except, as I told you before, men of your position are very apt to hear the worst about everything but very few words when things are going in first-class shape, and you are entitled to know that as well. Furthermore, I do not know and have never seen either Colonel Turnbull or Major Miller, but when men are doing a job like this for

our sons in the Army you responsible powerful men in Washington should get reports which are unprejudiced and I know to be factually true, for my son has had every advantage for 25 years that is available in this country. If it is good enough for him it is good enough for anybody else in the world. Of that I am positive.

Kindly do not bother to reply.

Respectfully,

L. H. PATTERSON.

#### STATEMENT ON LABOR POLICY BY NATIONAL FARMERS' UNION

[Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement issued on May 11, 1942, by James G. Patton, president of the National Farmers' Union, on labor policy, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### THE PATENT SYSTEM—ARTICLE BY RALPH D. MERSHON

[Mr. BROOKS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article by Ralph D. Mershon, on the patent system, published in the New York Herald-Tribune of April 30, 1939, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### PAY AND ALLOWANCES OF CERTAIN PERSONNEL

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BUNKER in the chair) laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 2025) to adjust the pay and allowances of personnel of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Public Health Service.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I move that the Senate disagree to the amendment of the House, request a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. REYNOLDS, Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, Mr. HILL, Mr. AUSTIN, and Mr. GURNEY conferees on the part of the Senate.

#### AMENDMENT OF THE NATIONAL HOUSING ACT

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6927) to amend the National Housing Act, and for other purposes, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. WAGNER. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. BANKHEAD, Mr. MALONEY, Mr. RADCLIFFE, Mr. DANAHER, and Mr. TAFT conferees on the part of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is concluded.

#### CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. McNARY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.



The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gillette	O'Daniel
Andrews	Glass	O'Mahoney
Austin	Green	Pepper
Ball	Gurney	Reynolds
Bankhead	Hatch	Rosier
Barkley	Hayden	Russell
Bilbo	Herring	Schwartz
Bone	Hill	Smathers
Brooks	Holman	Smith
Brown	Hughes	Spencer
Bulow	Johnson, Calif.	Stewart
Bunker	Johnson, Colo.	Truman
Butler	La Follette	Thomas, Okla.
Byrd	Langer	Taft
Capper	Lee	Tunnell
Caraway	McCarran	Tydings
Chandler	McFarland	Vandenberg
Chavez	McKellar	Van Nuys
Clark, Idaho	McNary	Wagner
Clark, Mo.	Maloney	Walsh
Danaher	Maybank	Wheeler
Downey	Millikin	White
Doxey	Murdock	Willis
George	Norris	
Gerry	Nye	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy-three Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

#### AGRICULTURE DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I move that the Senate now proceed to the consideration of House bill 6709, being the annual appropriation bill for the Department of Agriculture.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 6709), making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations, with amendments.

Mr. RUSSELL. I ask unanimous consent that the formal reading of the bill be dispensed with, that it be read for amendment, and that amendments of the committee be first considered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Georgia? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I think this is an appropriate time to make an inquiry, and probably to accompany it by an observation to the able Senator in charge of the bill. I have no objection to his request save the fact that I should like to ask that the committee amendment on page 80, lines 23, 24, and 25, be deferred for consideration until the meeting of the Senate on Monday next.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the provisions of the bill referred to by the Senator from Oregon are likely to produce more controversy than any other item in the bill. So far as I am concerned, I have no objection to having consideration of the amendment deferred until Monday. However, I hope that we shall be able to proceed today to dispose of the other amendments to the bill, so far as possible.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I shall cooperate with the Senator to that end. My request was made because several Senators and some of the farm leaders spoke to me about the matter. I think it would be well to postpone until Monday consideration of the amendment to which I have referred; and I hope that

if consideration of the amendment goes over until Monday, the matter may be adjusted among those who are concerned.

Mr. RUSSELL. I have no objection to having consideration of the amendment go over until Monday.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I think that the consideration of all amendments relating to the disposition of surplus commodities now held by the Commodity Credit Corporation should go over.

Mr. McNARY. Very well.

Mr. RUSSELL. Amendments in addition to the committee amendments may be offered, and the entire section would be involved.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I understand that that order has been made, and that that is the order of the day; is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes.

Mr. McNARY. I thank the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I desire to make a similar request with respect to the amendment relating to loans to be made under title I of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, which amendment is found on page 83.

Mr. RUSSELL. If the bill with those amendments cannot be disposed of this afternoon, I have told the Senator from Virginia that I would be willing to have them go over; but I think we can dispose of them today, and not have them go over until next week.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I think the Senator from Georgia is entirely too optimistic if he thinks that this afternoon we can dispose of all the amendments to the bill other than those referred to by the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I was basing my remark on what the Senator from Virginia told me. He told me that he was not desirous of discussing the amendments at any length, but that if they could not be disposed of today he desired to have them go over until Monday. I said I was willing to take that course.

Mr. BYRD. It is understood, then, that if the amendment is not reached this afternoon in time for action today, it will go over until Monday; is that correct?

Mr. RUSSELL. I have no objection to taking that course.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I assume that the Senator from Georgia will make an explanation of the details of the bill; will he not?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the bill has innumerable details. It would be impossible to undertake to discuss all of them in one statement. However, I shall point out that for the first time in many years the Committee on Appropriations has reported to the Senate an appropriation bill for the Department of Agriculture which is considerably below the Budget estimates. I should further point out that, taking the pending bill

as a whole, when we consider the direct appropriations of new money which are proposed by the measure, and do not consider the reappropriations or the standing appropriations and trust funds, the amount is \$447,240,159 below the appropriations provided for the Agricultural Department and its activities in the act for the current year. No other department or agency of the Government has accepted a reduction in expenditures in any wise approaching the very drastic reductions which have been made in the Department of Agriculture appropriation bill. Many of us who have stood on the floor of the Senate in years past have fought for a program which would permit the farmers of the Nation to approach something akin to equality with other groups have been very reluctant to see these very drastic reductions made and have accepted them only in view of the very dire extremity and emergency in which our Nation finds itself today.

The bill appropriates \$680,383,695 of new money, as compared with Budget estimates of \$693,454,129 and the appropriation for the current year of \$1,127,623,854. It will be seen, Mr. President, that the bill is, therefore, approximately \$13,070,434 below the Budget estimates.

The members of the subcommittee conducted hearings at some length on the bill. We endeavored to deal conservatively and fairly with all the many amendments which were proposed. The bill would be much further below the Budget estimates but for the fact that the committee has proposed the appropriation of substantial sums for items which were not included in the Budget estimates, covering matters which have arisen since the outbreak of the war. For example, the committee has included in the appropriations for the Forest Service an increase of \$5,500,000 over and above the Budget estimates, in order to enable the Department to deal with forest fires which might reduce the assets of the Nation which will be so sorely needed in the long and trying days which may lie ahead. Representations were made to the committee by a number of Members of the Senate and by officials of the Department that this has been a year of unusual fires in our forests. Losses running into the millions of dollars have been sustained by virtue of forest fires which have depleted the timber resources which are so immediately needed.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. DOWNEY. How does the figure fixed by the committee compare with the figure that came from the other House? Has there been a decrease or an increase in this item?

Mr. RUSSELL. I have undertaken to point out that there are five and a half million dollars provided in the bill dealing with the forest-fire problem over and above the appropriation in the House bill and above the Budget estimate. That is one item as to which the committee thought the change in circumstances since the Budget estimate was submitted justified our action in exceeding the Budget estimate.

There are a number of small items to the same tenor and effect. It was represented to the committee by officials of the War Department and in the Bureau of Plant Industry that unusual losses were being sustained in the vicinity of the various fields where young men are being trained and where air squadrons are stationed for national defense, because of the fact that no turf or grass has been found which will withstand the terrible backwash from the spin of the propeller of the high-speed engines which are placed in the airplanes of today. The committee, therefore, submits to the Senate for consideration an appropriation of \$50,000 over and above the Budget estimate so as to enable the Bureau of Plant Industry to survey the various airfields and to determine the type of grass which is best fitted for the soil and for the climate which obtain in the location of each airfield, and also to investigate and promote the production of a turf or grass which will be able to withstand the terrific impact of planes landing upon the ground as well as the backwash of the propellers.

Mr. President, another item the committee has considered and dealt with at some length is the appropriation for the Farm Security Administration. The House inflicted rather drastic reductions in the appropriations for the Farm Security Administration. Since the bill has passed the House of Representatives, the executive departments have sent to the committee additional estimates of approximately \$119,000,000 over and above the estimates which were originally submitted so as to provide funds for administration purposes and for loans by the Farm Security Administration. The committee, after examining the matter very carefully, has allowed some portion of those supplemental estimates and has restored, in part, some of the reductions which have been made by the House. Inasmuch as it has been indicated that there will probably be considerable discussion and attack made on the action of the committee with respect to the Farm Security Administration, I shall not dwell longer on those items at this time.

There are a number of items involving relatively small sums of money, anywhere from three to fifteen or twenty thousand dollars, which affect research work and the effort to find means with which to combat certain diseases which attack plant life as well as to combat insects which have caused losses, in some cases running into the millions of dollars by virtue of their destruction of plants which produce food and clothing. By and large, these items do not amount to any considerable total. The committee felt that they were justified in recommending these slight increases in view of the increasing demands which have been made upon the farmers of the country to produce food and clothing not only for domestic use but also in order to sustain our Allies and to fulfill our commitments under the lend-lease program. We have, therefore, made these small increases in the bill as it passed the House.

By and large, Mr. President, the bill, as I have stated, is substantially below the Budget estimate; it is almost a half billion dollars below the appropriation for the current year. These reductions could only be justified by the fact that the farmers of this Nation are making an unusual sacrifice, a greater sacrifice than has been made up to date by any other class of people who benefit directly from any specific appropriation bill. We make the exception only because we feel the reduction is commensurate with the dangers which threaten our Nation.

Mr. President, I believe that this is the best balanced bill, all in all, that the Committee on Appropriations has ever submitted for the Department of Agriculture. I hope that the amendments will all be agreed to. If any question arises as to any specific amendment, I shall be glad to undertake to answer it.

**THE PRESIDING OFFICER.** The clerk will proceed to state the amendments reported by the committee.

The first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the heading "Department of Agriculture—Office of the Secretary—Salaries," on page 3, line 24, after the word "forecast", to insert "except as to damage threatened or caused by insects and pests."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Office of Information—Salaries and expenses," on page 9, line 1, before the word "together", to strike out "\$490,144" and insert "\$400,144"; in line 9, after the name "District of Columbia", to strike out "\$455,891" and insert "\$467,291"; in line 14, after the name "United States", to strike out "\$70,832" and insert "\$60,832"; and on page 10, line 20, after the word "amended", to insert a colon and the following additional proviso: "Provided further, That in the preparation and distribution of duplicated and photographic material for the Department, the appropriation 'Salaries and expenses, Office of Information', current at the time such services are rendered or when payment therefor is received, may be reimbursed (by advance credits or reimbursements based on estimated or actual charges) from the applicable appropriations, to cover charges for personal services, materials, equipment (including depreciation, maintenance, and repair) and other necessary expenses."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Printing and binding," on page 11, line 11, before the word "including", to strike out "\$1,000,000" and insert "\$1,300,000."

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia explain the amendment at the bottom of page 10?

Mr. RUSSELL. The amendment just read involves the printing bill for all the bulletins as well as all the forms which are issued by the Department of Agriculture. In the program of the Agricultural Adjustment Administration several sets of forms are necessary for every farmer in the Nation. I think that there are entirely too many of them; we have

insisted that the Department simplify the procedure, and some steps in that direction have been taken. The Budget estimates in this matter were \$1,500,000. The House committee, after careful investigation, approved the full amount of the Budget estimates, but when the bill reached the floor of the House an amendment was offered reducing the printing item in the sum of \$500,000 as the result of a mistaken impression that the \$500,000 appropriation would wipe out the Year Book which Members of Congress send to their constituents. As a matter of fact, the Year Books, which are sent out by Members of Congress, are not provided for in the agricultural appropriation bill but are provided for in the legislative appropriation bill. The committee, after going into the matter very carefully, felt that we would have been justified in restoring the entire Budget estimate, but we restored only a part of it, and the item, as provided in the amendment, is \$200,000 below the Budget estimate.

**THE PRESIDING OFFICER** (Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment on page 11, line 11.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 12, at the end of line 19, to increase the total appropriation for Office of Information, from \$1,490,144 to \$1,700,144.

Mr. BYRD. I should like to ask the Senator from Georgia in regard to the Office of Facts and Figures. It seems that the Agricultural Department obtains certain parts of the appropriation provided for the Office of Facts and Figures. Does the Senator know anything about that?

Mr. RUSSELL. I am not familiar with that; I do not know exactly what the fund is; but I assume it is money which was allocated for the purchase of certain publications of the Department of Agriculture, just, as in the case of the legislative appropriation bill, a substantial sum is always carried for the purchase of Agricultural Year Books, which are distributed by Members of the House and Senate.

Mr. BYRD. That does not seem to be the case in this instance. On March 12 the Senator from Virginia received a letter from Mr. Archibald MacLeish in which he says:

Similarly I have not listed as employees of the Office of Facts and Figures the personnel of the Survey Division of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, Department of Agriculture. This Agency, as explained in the attached statement of organization on page 9, performs services for the Office of Facts and Figures through a transfer of funds.

I was wondering what the transfer of funds was from the Office of Facts and Figures to the Agricultural Department for the employment of personnel.

Mr. RUSSELL. That item is not as yet under consideration. The Senator from Virginia has referred to the Bureau of Agricultural Economics. I may say that that bureau is the only statistical agency of the Government which accumulates statistics in regard to every phase of



agriculture in the United States. There are a number of other agencies of the Government which use the Bureau of Agricultural Economics as a fact-finding and statistical agency. I assume that the funds were allocated for that purpose.

Mr. BYRD. Is the Bureau of Agricultural Economics reimbursed for the money which it spends in that way, and, if so, what would be the total amount the Bureau of Agricultural Economics would receive?

Mr. RUSSELL. I cannot answer that question; I have no idea how many other agencies of the Government use the Bureau of Agricultural Economics.

Mr. BYRD. The point I am making is that those expenses are not covered by this bill.

Mr. RUSSELL. I assume they are not.

Mr. BYRD. I think it would be very interesting if the Senator could obtain for the Record tomorrow a statement showing to what extent funds are transferred to the Bureau of Agricultural Economics from other departments.

Mr. RUSSELL. I shall be very glad to undertake to do so, with the limited facilities at my command. The Senator from Virginia and his committee probably have facilities which are much more adequate than those at my disposal.

Mr. BYRD. I assume this is an agricultural appropriation bill, and, since the money is spent by the Agricultural Department, there ought to be some way of ascertaining the facts.

Mr. RUSSELL. I am quite sure that the Agricultural Department, at my request or that of the Senator from Virginia, will be very glad to furnish the statement. Did Mr. MacLeish estimate how much money he had transferred to the Bureau of Agricultural Economics?

Mr. BYRD. I have a memorandum somewhere here. I think he gave an estimate for one quarter. Unfortunately, I do not have it on my desk. If the Senator can obtain the figures from the Department of Agriculture, I wish he would do so.

Mr. RUSSELL. I shall be delighted to undertake to obtain from the Department of Agriculture a statement of all funds transferred to the Bureau of Agricultural Economics from any department for furnishing statistical or other statements as to agricultural questions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment on page 12, line 19.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next amendment of the committee on appropriations will be stated.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Office of Experiment Stations—Payments to States, Hawaii, Alaska, and Puerto Rico for agricultural experiment stations," on page 15, line 24, after "(7 U. S. C. 427-427g), to strike out '\$2,263,708' and insert '\$2,463,708: *Provided*, That of this amount \$63,708 allotted in the fiscal year 1942 to prevent reduced allotments because of changes in relative rural population shall be apportioned in the fiscal year 1943 in the same amounts and to the same States

and Territory which received allotments from such sum in the fiscal year 1942."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 16, line 7, after the word "stations", to strike out "\$6,726,208" and insert "\$6,926,208."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 17, at the end of line 22, to increase the total appropriation for the Office of Experiment Stations, from \$6,982,705 to \$7,182,705.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Special Research Fund, Department of Agriculture," on page 18, line 24, after the word "act", to strike out the colon and the following proviso: "*Provided*, That not more than \$5,000 of this appropriation shall be used 'to further the chemical phases of the soybean investigations, except the routine analytical work for plant production, now being conducted at Urbana, Ill., and such \$5,000 shall be available only for the expenses incident to the transfer of such investigations to Peoria, Ill., for absorption by the Northern Regional Research Laboratory.'"

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Extension Service—Payments to States, Hawaii, Alaska, and Puerto Rico", on page 19, after line 20, to strike out:

Extension work, act of April 24, 1939: To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to carry into effect the provisions of the act entitled "An act to provide for the further development of cooperative agricultural extension work", approved April 24, 1939 (7 U. S. C. 343 c-1), as amended, \$203,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 20, after line 2 to insert:

Additional cooperative extension work: For additional cooperative agricultural extension work in agriculture and home economics, to be allotted and paid by the Secretary of Agriculture to the several States and the Territories of Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico, in such amounts as he may deem necessary to accomplish such purposes, \$555,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 21, line 7, after "343f-343g)", to strike out "\$100,000" and insert "\$128,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 21, line 9, after the words "extension work", to strike out "\$13,806,950" and insert "\$14,186,950"

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 22, at the end of line 4, to increase the total appropriation for the Extension Service from \$14,453,408 to \$14,833,408.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Bureau of Agricultural Economics," on page 22, line 21, after the word "organizations", to strike out "\$278,798" and insert "\$778,798", and on page 23, line 22, after the word "Department", to insert a colon and the following additional proviso: "*Provided further*, That no part of the funds herein appropriated or made available to the Bureau of Agricultural Economics shall

be used for cooperative agricultural program formulation."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 24, line 15, to increase the grand total appropriation, Office of the Secretary of Agriculture, from \$25,612,730 to \$26,902,730.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Bureau of Animal Industry—Salaries and expenses", on page 26, line 4, after the word "experiments", to strike out "\$794,080" and insert "\$811,000"; in line 12, after the word "appropriated", to strike out "\$229,080" and insert "\$246,000", and in line 14, after the word "amount", to strike out "\$45,000" and insert "\$47,420."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 26, line 22, after the word "products", to strike out "\$721,500" and insert "\$715,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 28, line 21, after the words "cattle ticks", to strike out "\$270,000" and insert "\$276,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 31, line 12, after the word "Industry", to strike out "\$12,671,967" and insert "\$12,688,387."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 32, at the end of line 22, to increase the total appropriation for the Bureau of Animal Industry from \$12,671,967 to \$12,688,387.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Bureau of Dairy Industry," on page 33, line 3, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$377,400" and insert "\$397,400", and in line 10, after the word "buildings", to strike out "\$764,757" and insert "\$779,757."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Bureau of Plant Industry—Salaries and Expenses," on page 34, line 19, after the word "control", to strike out "\$575,475" and insert "\$572,580", and in line 20, after the word "which", to strike out "\$25,000" and insert "\$37,685."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 35, line 19, after the word "control", to strike out "\$308,500" and insert "\$358,500."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 36, line 2, after the word "application", to strike out "\$258,460" and insert "\$243,460."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 37, line 11, after the word "surveys", to strike out "\$293,903" and insert "\$308,903."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 38, line 17, before the words "of which," to strike out "\$5,130,277" and insert "\$5,177,382", and in line 18, before the words "may be", to strike out "\$1,122,360" and insert "\$1,136,860."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Forest Service—Salaries and

Expenses," on page 43, line 23, after "Bankhead-Jones Farm-Tenant Act", to strike out "\$11,266,446" and insert "\$14,286,446."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 46, line 13, after the word "therefore", to strike out "\$124,350" and insert "\$133,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 46, line 14, after the word "expenses", to strike out "\$14,321,425" and insert "\$17,350,075", and in line 21, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$879,730" and insert "\$892,337."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Forest-Fire Cooperation", on page 47, line 15, after the word "act", to strike out "\$2,500,000" and insert "\$5,000,000" and in line 16, before the word "and", to strike out "\$68,800" and insert "\$74,830."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 47, at the end of line 26, to increase the total appropriation for the Forest Service from \$17,175,635 to \$22,704,285.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Forest roads and trails," on page 48, line 8, before the word "which", to strike out "\$6,500,000" and insert "\$7,500,000."

Mr. BYRD. Will not the Senator from Georgia explain the amendment? Does this amount include any new construction work on roads and trails?

Mr. RUSSELL. It does not; it merely provides \$4,300,000 for the maintenance of existing roads and trails, of which there are thousands of miles, and a sum sufficient to complete existing contracts which are already under way.

Mr. HAYDEN. It was shown that the large number of these roads were built by the Civilian Conservation Corps and by W. P. A. labor, and that they must be maintained.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment on page 48, line 8.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next amendment.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Bureau of Agricultural Chemistry and Engineering—Salaries and expenses", on page 50, line 15, after the word "agriculture" and the semicolon, to insert "for the investigation, development, experimental demonstration, and application of methods for the prevention and control of dust explosions and fires during the harvesting, handling, milling, processing, fumigating, and storing of agricultural products, and of other dust explosions and resulting fires not otherwise provided for;" and on page 51, line 12, after the word "reports", to strike out "\$318,733" and insert "\$333,733."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 52, line 1, after the word "Engineering", to strike out "\$892,484" and insert "\$907,484"; and in line 2, after the word "ex-

ceed", to strike out "\$508,133" and insert "\$516,133."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine—Salaries and Expenses," on page 53, line 8, after the word "nuts," to strike out "\$390,285" and insert "\$408,630."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 53, line 10, after the words "Japanese beetle," to strike out "\$82,275" and insert "\$432,275: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used to pay the cost or value of trees or other property injured or destroyed."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BYRD. Will not the Senator from Georgia explain this amendment? Is this for the control of the Japanese beetle and to what extent does it increase the appropriation above that of last year?

Mr. RUSSELL. This is exactly the same amount that is available for the current year. There is a slight increase, but it is due to promotions under the Ramspeck Automatic Promotion Act. It is also the amount of the Budget estimate. When the bill was pending in the House, an amendment was offered reducing the appropriation for Japanese beetle control by \$350,000. The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD discloses that only a very brief statement was made concerning the amendment. Its author stated that we should stop fighting the Japanese beetle and center all our attention on the Japs. Therefore he moved to cut the appropriation by \$350,000, for the purpose of affording money with which to buy a bombing plane.

The evidence before our committee disclosed that the Japanese beetle is inflicting damages in this country which run into the millions of dollars, and that if nothing is done to stop or control the pest, the loss might become so severe that it would be worse than the damage inflicted by the Japs themselves. The committee thought it was fully justified in recommending the amount in the bill.

Mr. BYRD. The recommended appropriation is the same as that of last year?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next amendment reported by the committee.

The next amendment was, on page 54, line 15, after the word "moths," to strike out "\$382,570" and insert "\$420,070."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 54, line 20, after the name "Ohio Valley," to strike out "\$356,475" and insert "\$406,475."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 55, line 13, after the word "quarantines," to strike out "\$92,190" and insert "\$109,790."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 56, line 4, after the word "shrubs," to strike out "\$184,680" and insert "\$199,680."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 56, line 10, after the words "corn borer," to strike out "\$349,395" and insert "\$399,395."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 56, line 15, after the word "purposes," to strike out "\$185,970" and insert "\$207,220."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 57, line 1, after the word "cotton," to strike out "\$123,895" and insert "\$148,439."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 57, line 12, after the word "stock," to strike out "\$75,100" and insert "\$82,100."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to offer an amendment on page 57, in line 17, in the item which reads:

Insects affecting man and animals: For insects affecting man, household possessions, and animals, \$175,105.

The Budget estimate for that item was \$190,000. The House reduced it to \$175,105. The Senate committee reported it as the House had passed it. What I wish to do at this time, if I may by unanimous consent, is to amend the figure by adding \$6,000, making the sum \$181,105.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. STEWART in the chair). Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Arizona that he may now offer the amendment? The Chair hears none.

Mr. HAYDEN. Let me explain that the purpose of the proposed increase is to complete work which is being done at Clear Lake, in California. In the extermination of some very troublesome gnats. Those engaged in the work think they have found a way to eradicate them and that it can be done in another year. The \$6,000 is needed for that purpose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment submitted by the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN].

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations will be stated.

The next amendment was, on page 59, line 8, after the name "Mexico," to strike out "\$716,300" and insert "\$719,550."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 60, line 1, after the word "Quarantine", to strike out "\$4,749,100" and insert "\$5,343,589."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Agricultural Marketing Service—Salaries", on page 66, line 2, after "(7 U. S. C. 471-476)", to strike out "\$471,945" and insert "\$481,945."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 66, line 17, after the word "agreements", to strike out "\$477,483" and insert "\$486,483."

The amendment was agreed to.



The next amendment was, on page 66, line 23, after the word "Act", to strike out "\$456,415" and insert "\$481,415."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 67, line 16, after "(7 U. S. C. 181-229)", to strike out "\$389,544" and insert "\$397,665."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 68, line 23, after the word "Service", to increase the total appropriation for salaries and expenses, Agricultural Marketing Service, from \$6,760,512 to \$6,812,633.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Enforcement of the Commodity Exchange Act", on page 69, line 19, after "(54 Stat 1059)", to strike out "\$569,587" and insert "\$469,587", and in line 20, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$207,525" and insert "\$157,525."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Soil Conservation Service—Salaries and Expenses", on page 72, line 8, after the word "installations", to strike out "\$1,314,429" and insert "\$1,364,429."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 72, line 17, after the word "information", to strike out "\$20,510,812" and insert "\$19,510,812."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 73, line 9, after the word "Service", to reduce the total appropriation for salaries and expenses, Soil Conservation Service, from \$22,402,204 to \$21,452,204.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] a question. The \$21,452,204, salaries and expenses, Soil Conservation Service, does not include, as I understand, the payments made to the county associations composed of committee men?

Mr. RUSSELL. No; it has no direct connection with that. This is the Soil Conservation Service, under which the farmers who live within the watershed of a stream will form a corporation for the purpose of carrying out an over-all conservation program within the area. This item is considerably less than the appropriation for the current year.

Mr. BYRD. The Senator is speaking of line 9, page 73?

Mr. RUSSELL. I am speaking about the appropriation in line 9, page 73, which is a total. The total involves the two items found on page 72. The committee increased the item in line 8 on page 72 by \$50,000, which is still below the Budget estimate, and in line 17 we reduced the amount \$1,000,000 below the Budget and the House figures. These items have to do with the operation of the Soil Conservation districts and not with the A. A. A. Of course, they are in a measure related to the activities of the Agricultural Adjustment Administration because the districts furnish the A. A. A. with expert opinions, and the result of all their studies as to soil conservation in the various districts, but they have no relation to the expenses of the county committeemen.

Mr. BYRD. Salaries and expenses, \$21,452,204, is in the nature of overhead expense, is it not?

Mr. RUSSELL. That is the total for all salaries and expenses which are incurred by the Soil Conservation Service. A considerable part of it is represented by salaries, because of the fact that the Soil Conservation Service endeavors to furnish an expert engineer to each and every one of the soil conservation districts. I do not know exactly what the proportion is. I know all of it is not for salaries and expenses, but there is a large item for salaries involved.

Mr. BYRD. Does it not say "Total, salaries and expenses"?

Mr. RUSSELL. Of course, it says "Total, salaries and expenses," but if the Senator will read the purposes involved, for example, on page 72, beginning in line 9, he will find them to be as follows:

Soil and moisture conservation and land-use operations, demonstrations, and information: For carrying out preventive measures to conserve soil and moisture, including such special measures as may be necessary to prevent floods and the siltation of reservoirs, and including the improvement of farm irrigation and land drainage, the establishment and operation of erosion nurseries, the making of conservation plans and surveys, and the dissemination of information, \$20,510,812.

Mr. BYRD. But it is for salaries and expenses?

Mr. RUSSELL. Of course, it is for salaries and expenses. Every appropriation in the bill in a measure is for salaries and expenses, except the ones providing for payments to farmers.

Mr. BYRD. Then the payments made by the Agricultural Adjustment Administration to the county committees, of course, would be in addition to any overhead expenses included in this \$21,000,000.

Mr. RUSSELL. Oh, yes; because the Soil Conservation Service is one bureau in the Department of Agriculture, and the Agricultural Adjustment Administration, which makes payment to county committees, is another bureau.

Mr. BYRD. Has the Senator figures of the expenses of the county committeemen?

Mr. RUSSELL. I have considerable information on that subject. Most of it was furnished by the able Senator from Virginia to the committee. We printed in the record considerable information as to the expenses of the county committeemen.

Mr. BYRD. The Senator from Virginia and the members of the Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Expenditures have been greatly disturbed over what is regarded as the very excessive costs of these county committees. It was developed before the Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Expenditures that there were 100,000 committeemen—

Mr. RUSSELL. I understood the figure was 90,000.

Mr. BYRD. I will say to the Senator that the testimony by Mr. Wilson, who I think is the assistant to the Agricultural Adjustment Administrator, indicates that there are 100,000. On page 339 of the hearings will be found the following:

Mr. WILSON. I want to say one thing more about our committeemen of over 100,000 that

are located in all the farming areas. We are constantly increasing the duties under this defense program—

And so forth. Then the chairman asked:

What is the total cost of these 100,000 committeemen?

Mr. WILSON. Forty-four million five hundred thousand dollars, most of which is wages of committeemen, and help in the county offices.

The CHAIRMAN. Forty-four million dollars? On what basis are they paid?

That question was answered by Mr. Duggan, who is with the Department:

Mr. DUGGAN. That is for the entire cost, which includes the clerical help as well as committeemen.

The CHAIRMAN. On what basis are the committeemen paid?

Mr. WILSON. They are paid on a per-day basis, on the days they actually work. Some of the county committeemen—there are three of those to a county—may work all the way from a month to something like full time in Illinois, where they have a big corn-loan program in addition to the ordinary program.

The CHAIRMAN. They get \$5 a day?

Mr. WILSON. It varies somewhat.

Mr. DUGGAN. In the southern region, nine Southern States, the county committeemen get \$4 a day, without any travel pay, and the community committeemen get \$3 a day, without any travel, for the days actually worked.

The CHAIRMAN. There is no travel allowance?

Mr. DUGGAN. There is no travel allowance.

The CHAIRMAN. They have to travel around to look at the farms?

Mr. DUGGAN. They have to do a good bit of traveling.

The CHAIRMAN. They do not charge anything for the automobile expenses?

Mr. DUGGAN. No expenses, except when they travel outside of the county to a special meeting.

That is about 10 percent of the amount of money appropriated for the soil-conservation program, and I was wondering if the Senator from Georgia has made any investigation as to whether that is an excessive cost, bearing in mind, of course, that that amount is deducted from the checks which are given the farmers under the soil-conservation program.

Mr. RUSSELL. The expenditures for administration of the Agricultural Adjustment Act seem at first blush to be very large. I confess the first time I heard that the total amount of the administrative expense of this organization was over \$40,000,000 I was not only startled—I was shocked. The committee went into this question at some length. The Senators from agricultural States, of course, are aware of the set-ups within their States. There is a community committee within the community. There is a county committee which has general supervision over the entire county. There is an office of the A. A. A. in each agricultural county of the United States. In that office there is an assistant administrator, who is usually the assistant to the county agent, who is the secretary of the county committee. It depends upon the size of the county, but all counties have at least one clerk, and some of the larger counties have seven or eight clerks to carry on the very involved and intricate

program of the Agricultural Adjustment Administration. The amount of the expenditures in the several counties varies somewhat due to the size of the farms, and the amount of production per acre per farm, and the number of those with whom the county committee and the local committees are compelled to deal.

Several witnesses appeared before us on this question. We went into the matter rather fully, as I think the hearings will disclose. While the present system is subject to criticism, and while it does seem that the cost is excessive, the Appropriations Committee was not able to present any better system in an agricultural bill.

I wish to point out that the individual farmers are notified as to the amount which is deducted from their checks to pay for the county committee and for all the administrative expenses in the county.

There is a great deal more involved in the operation of this program than appears at first blush. Every farm must be measured every year.

Mr. BYRD. That is done by airplane photography, is it not?

Mr. RUSSELL. In some sections of the country it is, but in others it is not done by airplane. Often a farmer will complain that his land has not been measured accurately by airplane. The county committee must then remeasure it. If the farmer is correct, the expense is borne by the county committee. If the committee is correct, the farmer must pay the cost of the survey of his tract of land, or the plot which he has planted to one of the commodities embraced within the control program. If any better system can be evolved for dealing with the question of administration I wish some Senator would suggest it. I do not think the Appropriations Committee can deal with it, because the procedure is set up by statute. We have a statute which regulates expenditures for the administration of this program. I was the author of an amendment which had something to do with bringing that statute into being. When the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 was under consideration on the floor of the Senate I offered an amendment which limited the total amount of administrative expenses to 5 percent of the total appropriation. When the bill went to conference it was decided that the limitation should be changed; that a limitation of 1 percent of the total appropriation should be placed upon the expenses of the A. A. A. in Washington; that not more than 2 percent of the appropriation should be spent for field work outside Washington, in the regional and State offices, but that the amount which might be spent by the county committees required a degree of flexibility which prohibited placing any fixed percentage upon it. The law provides that each farmer shall be notified of the percentage of his check which has gone into county administrative expenses. I think the farmers of the United States are pretty much the same, but if there is any place where the farmers have to watch every nickel, it is in the section from which I come.

I must say that up to this good day I have never had a single complaint from a farmer that too much had been deducted from his check for administrative expenses within the county.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I have had exactly the same experience. I have not had a single complaint since the law was enacted.

Mr. BYRD. Last week end I took occasion to discuss the matter with some of the farmers in Virginia. They did not know to what extent deductions had been made. In the State of Virginia 15 percent of the entire soil conservation appropriation is deducted. In other States, as the Senator knows, the percentage is greater. It varies from 40 percent in one county to 4 or 5 percent in another. It is inconceivable to the Senator from Virginia that with such a tremendous variation, the same work is being done in each county. I think that if the farmers knew definitely that \$42,000,000 was coming off their checks for administrative expenses they would object. The money comes out of the Treasury of the United States; and even if the farmers do not object to it, the Congress should do so, provided the expenditure is extravagant. If the farmers understood that \$42,000,000 was taken off their checks by reason of the expenses of the 90,000 or 100,000 county committeemen—or whatever the number may be—I think very strenuous objection would be raised.

Mr. RUSSELL. When we state the total, it seems much larger than the deduction seems to the individual farmer in the county when he is told what percentage of his check has been deducted for county administrative expenses. The law requires that the farmer be apprised of the amount deducted; and if the law is not being observed by the State committee or State organization in Virginia, someone should be brought to bar for it. Let me read the provision of the act:

In the event any administrative expenses of any county or local committee are deducted in any fiscal year, beginning with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1939, from Soil Conservation Act payments, parity payments, or loans, each farmer receiving benefits under such provisions shall be apprised of the amount or percentage deducted from such benefit payment or loan on account of such administrative expenses. The names and addresses of the members and employees of any county or local committee, and the amount of such compensation received by each of them, shall be posted annually in a conspicuous place in the area within which they are employed.

Mr. BYRD. Does that apply to the county committeemen?

Mr. RUSSELL. That is what it says.

Mr. BYRD. Read it again.

Mr. RUSSELL. I shall be glad to read it again. It not only applies to county committees, but also to local and community committees within the county.

In the event any administrative expenses of any county or local committee are deducted in any fiscal year, beginning with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1939, from Soil Conservation Act payments, parity payments,

or loans, each farmer receiving benefits under such provisions shall be apprised of the amount or percentage deducted from such benefit payment or loan on account of such administrative expenses.

Listen to this:

The names and addresses of the members and employees of any county or local committee, and the amount of such compensation received by each of them, shall be posted annually in a conspicuous place in the area within which they are employed.

There is a very plain and clear mandate in the law that the percentage which is deducted from each farmer's check, as well as the compensation going to each committeeman, and to every employee of the committee, shall be posted in a conspicuous place within the county. We cannot handle the matter in the agricultural appropriation bill. If there is a condition which should be remedied it should be approached through general legislation which will go to the standing Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. For my part, I do not want the job of trying to draw a bill to change the present system.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I think it has been thoroughly established by the testimony before both the Committee on Appropriations and the Committee to Investigate Executive Agencies of the Government that the county committeemen actually draw, in expenses and salary, the sum of \$44,000,000.

Mr. RUSSELL. Oh, no, Mr. President. That is not a correct statement. The \$44,000,000 does not go to the committeemen. That is the total expenses of the administration within the counties.

Mr. BYRD. That is correct. It is the administrative cost of the county associations.

Mr. RUSSELL. That includes several clerks who keep up with the various forms, and all the employees.

Mr. BYRD. It is the expenses of the county organizations.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is correct.

Mr. BYRD. The major part of it goes to the county committeemen.

Mr. RUSSELL. No; the Senator is mistaken. A very small percentage of it goes to the county committeemen.

Mr. BYRD. The Senator is mistaken. A large percentage of it goes to the county committeemen. There are only one or two clerks in each county. This amount does not include the cost of the county agents' offices. It does not include the cost of the A. A. A. office.

Mr. RUSSELL. It does include the cost of the A. A. A. office.

Mr. BYRD. I mean it does not include the cost of the Soil Conservation Office or the Farm Agent Office. That is \$21,000,000. It includes only the A. A. A. office, and one or two clerks. We could probably get a break-down of it. The major part of it undoubtedly is the \$5, \$3, or \$4 a day which each of the 100,000 committeemen draws, plus traveling expenses, which alone amount to \$2,000,000.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator from Virginia is absolutely in error. On an average, the various county committees throughout the United States do not meet more than once or twice a month.



The great bulk of this expenditure is for personal services, for clerical hire within the county committee. A great many States have a limitation on the number of days the committee may be in session in any one year. There is very keen competition among the several counties as to how long the committees may be in session; and while the total amount of the expenditure is enormous, as the Senator from Virginia has pointed out, I venture to say that not 20 percent of the total ever gets into the hands of the committeemen.

Mr. BYRD. I have a list showing what each county committeeman receives. The list is in my office. I shall be glad to have it inserted in the Record later. The list gives the names of the county committeemen, and the amount which each receives.

Let us assume that the amount is for the cost of the county organization, which is independent of the other overhead costs of the Agricultural Department, independent of the farm agent's office, and other things. The total varies tremendously from county to county and from State to State. Take Alabama as an example. The average cost there is 8 percent. The cost in that State is \$1,036,000, out of total payments to the farmers of \$12,914,000. In Arizona the cost is 3.8 percent. In Arkansas the cost is 4.4 percent, making a total of \$625,000 out of payments to the farmers of \$14,000,000. In other words, in Alabama \$2,000,000 less is received by the farmers, and about \$400,000 more is paid for the cost of the county organizations, as compared to Arkansas.

In California the average cost is 10 percent of the amount given to the farmers under the Soil Conservation Act. In Colorado the cost is  $8\frac{1}{2}$  percent; in Connecticut, 10 percent; in Delaware, 5.9 percent; in Florida, 10.7 percent; and in Georgia, 9 percent. Out of a total expenditure of \$12,000,000, \$1,094,000 is paid for the expenses of the county organizations.

In Idaho the cost is 10.7 percent; in Illinois, 4.9 percent; in Indiana, 7 percent. There are great variations as between county and county, in all the States. In Iowa the cost is 4.8 percent. In Kansas it is exactly the same as in Iowa—4.8 percent. In Kentucky it is 11.6 percent. The variations between the counties in each State apparently run as high as 18, 20, and sometimes 25 percent, and down to 4 and 5 percent, as between individual counties. There must be some reason for the great variation. The Senator from Virginia and the committee with which he is associated have made a very diligent effort to find out why these variations occur between the States and the counties, but as yet have been unable to do so.

In Louisiana the cost is 7.4 percent; in Maine 7.4 percent; in Maryland 7.6 percent; in Massachusetts 13.3 percent; in Michigan 12 percent; in Minnesota 5.9 percent; in Mississippi 4.7 percent; in Missouri 10.1 percent; in Montana 5.8 percent; in Nebraska 7 percent; in Nevada 5.2 percent; in New Hampshire 14.3 percent; in New Jersey 10.1 percent; in New Mexico 9.9 percent; in New York

11.2 percent; in North Carolina 11.9 percent; in North Dakota 5.1 percent; in Ohio 9.3 percent; in Oklahoma 6.7 percent; in Oregon 10.3 percent; in Pennsylvania 12.1 percent; in Rhode Island 20.6 percent. Of course, Rhode Island is a small State, but it has the highest overhead expense of all. In South Carolina the cost is 6.4 percent; in South Dakota 6.6 percent; in Tennessee 12 percent; in Texas 5.8 percent; in Utah 11.5 percent; in Vermont 12 percent.

Now let us take Virginia. I desire to make some references to Virginia. I know the State thoroughly. The average cost in Virginia, for the entire State, is 15.1 percent. Four million eighty-two thousand eight hundred and sixty-two dollars was disbursed, with the county association expense being \$614,407. Six hundred and fourteen thousand four hundred and seven dollars as expenses for these county organizations was deducted from the checks received by the farmers of Virginia.

Let me call the attention of the Senate to some of the variations occurring between counties with which I happen to be familiar. For example, Clarke County, the county in which I live, had expenses of 5.8 percent. The expense for Culpeper County was 31 percent. Both of them are strictly agricultural counties, and as between them there is a variation between 5.8 percent to 31 percent.

Arlington County, which is a small county next to Washington, is joined with Fairfax County in this compilation. Fairfax County is a considerable agricultural county. The expense there is 41.2 percent. Forty-one and two-tenths percent is deducted on account of the expenses of the county committees from the check that every farmer in Arlington and Fairfax Counties receives. In Franklin County, which is a great tobacco-raising county, and entirely an agricultural county, the expense is 26 percent. Yet Frederick County, another agricultural county, has expenses of only 10 percent. In Giles County the expense is 21 percent. Similar variations exist as between all the counties.

I am unable to understand how one county under similar conditions can operate at 6 or 8 percent, and other counties at 20, 30, and 40 percent; and thus far, so far as I know, no satisfactory explanation has been made to any committee with respect to such variations.

Let us take Pittsylvania County, in Virginia, which is one of the largest tobacco-raising counties in the United States. In Pittsylvania County the expense is 13 percent, while in Patrick County, which is near it, the expense is 36 percent.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I desired to inquire about the payment to the county committees to which the Senator refers. Am I to understand that there are 100,000 men in the United States who are paid more than \$40,000,000, or does the \$40,000,000 also include the amounts to which the Senator has referred?

Mr. BYRD. The \$40,000,000 includes the expenses of the county organizations,

but that amount is entirely independent of expenses of other agricultural organizations which are set up and paid for in every county of the United States.

Mr. TAFT. Does the Senator have any idea as to how much on an average is earned by those 100,000 members of the county committees in the United States?

Mr. BYRD. I have an itemized statement of what every county committeeman received last year, but at this moment the statement happens to be in my office. I will present it to the Senate tomorrow.

I think the sum is very substantial; because it is unquestionably true, I think, from my knowledge of the operations of these county organizations, that the main cost arises in connection with the payment of the county committeemen. A county committeeman has one or two clerks, perhaps. The surveying is almost entirely done by aerial photography. That was testified before the committee of which I am chairman. That work was not placed upon the members of the county committees. However, there has always been a question about how much these payments are. They do not function through the Budget. The Senator from Ohio understands that. There is a provision in the Budget whereby a deduction is made from the \$5,000,000 provided for soil conservation for the purpose of paying these county committeemen.

Mr. TAFT. Do they also receive a percentage of the parity payments which are made?

Mr. BYRD. They also receive a percentage of the parity payments, and that is included in the \$44,000,000.

The break-down of the county association costs is as follows:

Conservation and use of agricultural land resources, \$27,693,459; parity payments, \$8,855,177; sugar payments, \$407,267; crop insurance, \$2,071,990; supplemental cotton, \$2,916,983; making a total for the fiscal year 1941 of \$41,944,876.

Mr. TAFT. Is there any other department of the Government with anything like that number of employees outside of Washington?

Mr. BYRD. I do not know of any. The figure varies; but certainly it is between 90,000 and 100,000. As a matter of fact, a Mr. Wilson testified before the committee that his estimate was 100,000.

I also desire to call to the attention of the Senator from Ohio the fact that these committeemen draw very substantial mileage payments, at the rate of 3, 4, or 5 cents a mile for their traveling expenses.

Mr. TAFT. Can the Senator tell me whether they also receive X cards under the gasoline rationing plan?

Mr. BYRD. I shall soon be able to find out.

Mr. TAFT. I should assume they do, so far as I have read the regulations.

Mr. BYRD. Travel expenses vary enormously in different States.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, before the Senator leaves the subject, let me say that I noted his inquiry, and I wondered whether there was any explanation about the variation in the sums of money expended in the different units. So far as

the expenses in the counties are concerned, I have observed the difference in the quantity of work in the various counties or districts in my State. I took an interest in this particular subject, and I went about and saw the work being done at river bends, where erosion occurred during storms and freshets, and on roads where ground was denuded by the wind; those conditions differed in the various counties.

Mr. BYRD. I will say to the Senator that I am referring to the cost of the county associations which have operated under the Agricultural Adjustment Act program.

Mr. AUSTIN. I thought the Senator was referring to the amendment on page 72.

Mr. BYRD. No; I was referring to the cost of the county associations operating under the Agricultural Adjustment Act program. I have never been able to obtain a satisfactory explanation, and neither has the Senator from Georgia, as to the reason for the variation in these costs.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I may say with reference to the costs of the county organizations in the various States that the larger the agricultural units the smaller the costs for administration. For instance, Montana, with large agricultural units, has an administrative cost of only 5 percent, whereas Rhode Island, where the agricultural units are necessarily small, has an administrative cost of approximately 28 percent. In other words, if the farmer receives twenty \$5 checks the administrative costs might be \$7 or \$8—I do not know what the exact amount is—whereas in some of the western States, or in States in which there are large orchards, for instance, if the farmer were to receive a check for several hundred dollars the administrative cost might not be much more than \$7 or \$8. I think that is the explanation as to why the cost is more in some States than it is in others.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Virginia yield for a moment?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Let me ask the Senator from Vermont why should the cost in Ohio be 9.3 percent, while in Illinois the cost is 4.9 percent, although the agricultural conditions are almost completely identical in the two States?

Mr. AIKEN. I suppose there are more small farms in Ohio than in Illinois. There are more small centers of population in Ohio. Around every large center of population there is a myriad of small farms. Illinois has the great city of Chicago, and in that State one can go almost 100 miles south of Chicago without coming to any city of appreciable size.

Mr. TAFT. I do not think the Senator will find that there is any great difference between conditions in Illinois and in Ohio, and certainly so far as I can observe, nothing to justify a nearly 100 percent increase in cost in Ohio over what the cost is in Illinois.

Mr. AIKEN. Of course, another explanation might be that the activities

might be better administered in one State than in another.

Mr. TAFT. It seems to me that that must be the explanation, that there is a large amount of waste in some places and no waste in other places, and that is the waste the Senator from Virginia is trying to eliminate.

Mr. BYRD. We will take the State of Virginia, for example: Most of the farms of the State of Virginia are fairly large, yet the cost in the State of Virginia is 15 percent. That is not due to smaller payments, because the State of Virginia receives \$4,082,000, which is practically the average of what is received by the other States.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LA FOLLETTE in the chair). Does the Senator from Virginia yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER. I think, perhaps, some of the difference in the expenses can be accounted for by the fact that the program in the various counties is operated differently. There are certain extracurricular activities, perhaps, which are possible under the act which are not taken advantage of in some counties but are taken advantage of in others. For instance, I should like to ask the Senator from Virginia if the list he expects to furnish tomorrow of county committeemen includes a list of farm field women who are active in some counties but are not employed in other counties?

Mr. BYRD. Are they farm demonstrators or are they members of county committees?

Mr. BUTLER. They are employees of the A. A. A. organization of the county. I myself would appreciate knowing exactly what the service to be rendered is supposed to be. I might suggest that it would be interesting when the Senator is making a statement of the comparison of the cost of distribution of payments to farmers to indicate why the percentage not only varies as between the States and as between counties in the States but varies over the years. For instance, why should it cost 13 or 14 percent to administer a certain farm in Nebraska in an election year and cost only 7 or 8 percent in an off year? I use that as a practical illustration. That is one of the questions which many of the farmers in my State are beginning to ask.

Mr. BYRD. I will try to get the information for the Senator.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President—

Mr. BYRD. I yield to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I was a member of the committee that prepared the Agricultural Adjustment Act in 1938; I took an active part in its consideration and enactment, and was a member of the conference committee between the two Houses on that bill. The conference committee was in session for an entire month, working as best it could, without regard to political division, for politics never entered into the consideration at any time, in an effort to develop a pro-

gram that could be administered satisfactorily. There had been general complaint over the country in farm areas about the administration of the program prior to 1938, when there were not any legal standards of formulas for administration, but it was left very largely to the discretion and judgment of the Secretary of Agriculture to formulate and put into operation the program and the method of administering it. That resulted in charges of partiality and favoritism, of mistakes being made, of inadequate reviews, and appeals, and things of that sort. So those responsible for agricultural legislation felt that some uniform plan applying equally as best it could to the varying conditions should be developed.

Among the things the committee agreed on was to develop, so far as possible, a program which would be administered by the farmers themselves. In other words, Congress had set aside a certain amount of money for expenditure among farmers, for soil conservation, to prevent soil depletion, and for practices of that sort. Then, the two Houses, working in a conference committee whose report was later ratified after protracted debate on the floor, developed the plan we now have for the farmers themselves to administer, so far as possible, their own agricultural program, freed so far as possible—it was not entirely possible in all cases and under all circumstances—from the necessity for any regulation which, in large measure, had to be uniform but which did not fit each locality alike.

So it was decided, in the first place, that this program should be administered by representatives of the counties. The county agent is not in charge; he is secretary of the county committee. It was decided that the county committee should be elected by the farmers themselves, three for each county to constitute a county committee. Then, the county should be divided into areas to be administered by community committeemen, usually composed of three members of the community.

The community committeemen are also, under the law, mandatorily elected by the farmers of the community. If they do not administer fairly, if they incur unnecessary expenses, or if their practices do not appear to be fair and just, they are subject every year to rejection by their neighbors.

Mr. BYRD. If the Senator will permit me to interrupt him, those elections are absolutely perfunctory. In my State a small percentage of the farmers attend an election, frequently not more than 20 or 30 to a county.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I think in Virginia they generally do what the junior Senator from Virginia tells them to do. In a great many other States, they do not want to do that.

Mr. BYRD. The Senator from Virginia would tell them to vote to cut these extravagances out. The truth is, however, no one can tell the Virginia farmers what to do.

Mr. BANKHEAD. In my judgment, then, the Senator has not told the farm-



ers all; he has said less to the farmers than he has said to the Congress and the committees of Congress, I am sure.

Mr. BYRD. The Senator is mistaken. I have said in Virginia exactly what I have said in Congress and have been saying it for 9 years. The Senator is wrong, and he knows nothing about it.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I know something about the farmers of the country.

Mr. BYRD. The Senator does not know what I say to the farmers of my State.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I said it was my judgment.

Mr. BYRD. But the Senator's judgment is wrong; it is not based on any knowledge of the facts.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I will let the Senator have it his way. If I had known the Senator was going to take it so seriously I would not have said what I said.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is going to make a plea in behalf of the official reporters, and ask that Senators kindly address the Chair.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Of course, I will observe the rule, Mr. President, but I am speaking in the time generously accorded me by the Senator from Virginia because he said he had not been able to find out certain facts and had not had any satisfactory explanation. While I am sure I could not make any explanation which would satisfy him, still I thought because of my close contact with this whole problem I would submit at least some facts in connection with the farmers who are involved.

Whether the farmers of Virginia or elsewhere attend the election is just as it is in the case of a general election. Perhaps 20 or 30 percent vote. A great many good citizens never participate in a general election. But it is their fault if they do not. They have the privilege of voting. If they do not participate they have no one to blame but themselves. So it is in the case of the election of committeemen under the farm program. A day is set for the election throughout the agricultural area. Such farmers as feel any interest in the matter attend the meetings, and generally in my section more or less interest in the election is stirred up by virtue of the ambition of different farmers to represent the farmers on the committee.

While on that subject, I may be permitted to say to Senators who are seriously looking into this subject that service both on the community committee and on the county committee is in a large measure an honorary and noncompensated service. Three dollars a day is what a committeeman receives.

Mr. BYRD. Five dollars a day in some places.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I do not think they receive that much in my State. It is from \$3 to \$5.

Mr. BYRD. From \$3 to \$5.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I referred to my own State. I think they receive \$3 a day, but the provision is for payment of from three to five dollars. In my State the service is limited to 5 days a month. The committeemen do not receive any traveling expenses. Not only do they not have

X cards, but they do not receive any free gasoline. Anyone may judge from this that the farmer who neglects his own personal affairs and undertakes to render this service is not doing it because of any profit involved. He is rendering the service in order to do his part.

Mr. BYRD. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Let me finish the sentence. He is doing it in order to do his part toward his neighbors, and in the effort to promote a good and satisfactory agricultural program, his benefit coming from the program itself, rather than from a return from this special and extra service to his neighbors. I now yield to the Senator.

Mr. BYRD. Alabama is listed as receiving in travel expenses, in the matter of agricultural adjustment administration mileage, \$19,596.86, and the county office travel amounts to \$3,104.36.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I think the Senator will realize that that is nominal.

Mr. BYRD. The Senator stated there were not any travel expenses.

Mr. BANKHEAD. The community committeemen do not receive expenses, but they have to travel from one place to another. They have conferences, they go to the State and land-grant colleges on various occasions, and then some traveling allowance is made. I am talking about the regular, usual mileage, the mileage which Federal and State officials ordinarily draw.

There are 67 counties in Alabama, and there is an average of 30 members in each county on these committees. Then think of traveling expenses of only \$19,000. It is nothing, as we all know, for a year's program, with this large number of men, covering such a large area.

Let me point out that there are about 3,000 counties in the United States, some small, some large, some with very small farms, some with very large farms. In some areas, where the farming is largely truck farming, or other special production, or down in the southeastern part of the country, the farms are very much smaller than they are in the grain area of the West. A cotton farmer may plant 15 or 20 acres in cotton—that is about the average—but in the West, in the wheat section, a farmer may plant a whole section, of 640 acres. There are more than 6,000,000 farmers. Each one of those farmers, under the law—I do not know how it would be possible to justly administer the law in any other way—must be visited, not once, but two or three times, at least, during the year. There are more than 6,000,000 of them, remember, some near the county seat, some 50 to 60 or 100 miles away from the county seat, where the county committee is located and has its headquarters.

Under the law the committeemen have to measure each farm—over 6,000,000 of them—for there is no other way to determine the facts required. There are many complaints about excessive acreage, about one farmer cheating against his neighbor in the matter of acreage put into production in excess of the allotments. So the committees—

and we have approved it—decided that the only fair and just way, not only as between neighbors, but in the matter of having satisfactory programs to continue from time to time, was not continually to take ex parte statements of the farmers, but to provide for obtaining accurate information. Therefore measurements are made, not only in respect of the main crop, but as to other soil-depleting crops, because one of the elements in soil conservation is a requirement for rotation in the use of particular land from time to time, in order to let the land either be fallow or to rebuild, by having it planted in some crop which is not so soil depleting. Therefore, we are not limited to the measurement of acreage devoted to wheat, or cotton, or potatoes, or peanuts. The agents measure the other soil depleting crops, because the program specifies how many acres in each farm is to be planted in different crops, and excessive production in other things than the main crop is penalized. That is the only way of bringing about compliance, as has been shown by a number of years of experience.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Virginia yield, and if so, to whom?

Mr. BYRD. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee to ask a question of the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is what I desire to do. Like the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the chairman of the subcommittee, I was utterly dumbfounded when I learned that we take away from the fund provided for soil erosion payments what would otherwise go to the farmers and spend the enormous sum of forty-four and a half million dollars, out of the farmers' money, for the administration of this activity. It was so astounding to me—and it is still so astounding to me—that I asked a great many questions about it from time to time before the several committees before which the matter has arisen. It strikes me that there should be a better and a more economical administration. I was very much impressed by the statement made by the Senator from Georgia a moment ago that if a more economical plan could be evolved he would like to have it proposed for he knew there was an enormous amount of expense connected with this activity.

As the Senator from Alabama knows, and as every other Senator knows—there is not one who is not familiar with the fact—there are county agents in every one of the 3,000 counties of the country. Each county agent has to go on to every farm in his county, he is constantly in touch with every farmer in the county. I know the one in my home county, Shelby County, Tenn., is a man who keeps in touch with every farmer and every farm, as well as any man could do it.

Mr. BANKHEAD. It is done by his office, rather than by the agent himself.

Mr. McKELLAR. He goes to all parts of the county. He is a very excellent man. The question I wish to ask the Senator from Alabama, as well as the

Senator from Georgia, is, Do they not think we could take the county-agent plan, and have this matter taken care of by the county agent in each county, who is already concerned and tremendously interested in the very same work, and presumably is one of the best men in the county? Why could not this work be done by the county agent at about one-tenth the cost?

I note from the figures read, and from the testimony, that it costs all the way from 4 percent up to 11 percent to administer this program in the various counties in the country. Why could we not evolve a plan which would be less expensive than the present one? The present plan seems to be very expensive. I am not familiar with the agricultural appropriation bill, as are the Senator from Alabama and the Senator from Georgia. I know they are as fine friends of the farmer as there are in the world. I have the greatest respect and esteem and admiration for their ability, and for their loyalty to the farmer. When we are spending such an enormous amount of money for the prevention of soil erosion, which very properly goes to the farmers, why should we pay an excessive cost, by some 7 or 8 percent, for this relatively uneconomical activity?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I recognize the good faith of the Senator in his suggestion. I know that his heart is with the farmer. I have seen that tested time and time again. I know what he proposes is suggested in good faith and in the interest of the farmers. No one who knows the Senator and is familiar with his record could doubt that.

There are two difficulties with his suggestion. In the first place, no human being could perform all the duties in an average agricultural county which the Senator seems to want to delegate to the county committeemen. I know that Senators from the agricultural section will confirm my statement that the office of the county agent in nearly every county is the busiest office in the county seat. My travels in this connection have been limited largely to my State, but wherever I have gone in my State I have found in the last few years that the space in the court house assigned to the county agent was not adequate. In nearly every section of the country small houses have been erected for the county agents, because farmers were there all day long consulting the county agent about the management of their farms and other farm matters.

The county agent is both an administrative officer and an educational officer. He is the representative of the experiment stations and the land-grant colleges. He is the man who promulgates new information to the farmers about profits and farm purchases, about new developments, and everything of that sort. He has to hold conferences all over the county from time to time.

There is another phase of the matter which has not been suggested. In addition to the subject of acreage to be planted, the county agent also has the responsibility—and exercises it largely through his community committeemen—of checking the work done on each farm,

what is known as adjustment practices, which entitle the farmer to pay in addition to the general conservation payments.

If the farmer plants certain cover crops, such as Austrian peas and vetch, if he works the land so as to interrupt the flowage of water, and terraces his farm in the interest of preserving the soil, that is looking to the future, that is looking to the replacement of plant food which is taken from the ground when it is overflowed and soil is eroded from it, and eventually is carried to the sea. The Government is doing all it can to encourage the farmer to engage in soil erosion prevention, and soil protection, and rebuilding of its fertility. That is a job too great for any one man in a county to do. Someone must report on those practices. Someone has to check the acreage on each farm, what sort of work was done on it, how much was done, the estimated expense of each of those practices, which we know to be the very best part of the soil-conservation program. We must look not only to increased production on the farm, but to the preservation of the soil so we may produce food in quantities sufficient to feed the growing urban population of this country.

I shall touch on one other phase if the Senator from Virginia, who has been very kind, will permit me. I thought while I had this opportunity I would submit what I have to say on this subject, and it will obviate the necessity of listening to me later. I refer to the question of the percentages which the Senator from Virginia emphasized so much. That is a situation which could not under any circumstances be avoided. The quantity of work to be done is the major factor in the cost in each county, and the number of farms is the major factor in determining the percentage to apply to each farm. Take a county which has 5,000 small farmers. It is necessary three or four times a year to go to the 5,000 farms to check compliance, to check the actual soil-conservation practices, to check the other crops, to check production. Do not forget that. It is necessary to secure information about the production on every farm as the basis for division of the soil-conservation money and the parity appropriation, and that is a tremendous task in itself.

The percentage will, of course, vary with the number of farmers and the size of the farms. It cannot be made to work out exactly the same in all counties. There is no desire on the part of anyone of whom I have ever heard to favor one county at the expense of another in the matter of the percentage of the appropriation for a county. It simply works out according to the number of farms, the size of the farms, the conservation practices, and the number of crops produced on each farm. It is easier to check a great wheat acreage than it is an acreage on which a farmer has a half a dozen or more crops which must be checked.

Mr. President, this is not the measure in connection with which to undertake a settlement of this difficult and complicated problem. That is a legislative matter. We worked on the problem for

months, and the program evolved has stood the test until now. I have had no complaints from the farmers of my State. They look to me in large measure, as Senators can well understand, for a satisfactory farm program. For a short time after the program was adopted, and until it became properly adjusted my desk was covered every day with protests and objections. Now they have disappeared. The farmers are administering their own affairs. They know if administration needs improvement it is within their power to make the improvement. All they have to do is to elect those whose views are in line with theirs. So, on the whole, the matters which are worrying the Senator from Virginia are not worrying the farmers in my section of the country, and I doubt if many Senators have received letters from farmers making complaint of these matters which are totally and wholly within their control.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. Before the Senator from Alabama concludes his remarks I should like to correct one impression which has resulted from some statements which have been made. It has been stated that the appropriation in question was only four hundred and fifty-odd million dollars, of which \$44,000,000 was for administrative expense. That impression is erroneous. It involves not only the \$450,000,000 for the soil conservation program, but it also includes \$212,000,000 which was paid last year for parity payments. It includes forty-seven and a half million dollars which was paid for sugar payments in certain counties. More than \$2,000,000 of local committee expense was involved in administering the crop-insurance law for wheat, and that expense will increase undoubtedly as other commodities are added. There were also additional expenditures incurred in the Cotton Belt in administering the special cotton program this year, under which cotton goods were paid to farmers who reduced their acreage below their allotted acreage. So the statement that this is merely for administering the soil conservation program is entirely in error. Not only do those in charge administer parity payments and other funds amounting to \$728,000,000, but the local committees have assumed responsibility for the success of the food-for-victory program. They are going to each farm to encourage the farmer to plant a garden, and to increase his acreage in the specialty crops which the Secretary of Agriculture has stated were required for the success of the war program. It is not simply a soil conservation program. It has to do with the production program within every agricultural county in the Nation.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I am delighted that the Senator from Georgia has brought out that point. It is familiar, of course, to those of us on the committee, but I might not have mentioned it. This expenditure covers every activity in the whole Department of Agriculture.

Mr. BYRD. I think the Senator ought to make it clear that that is the



expense of the county committee. I read into the RECORD exactly what the Senator from Georgia said and gave a statement as to how much was chargeable for the conservation and use of agricultural land resources, how much for parity payments, how much for sugar—and only \$407,000 goes for sugar—how much for crop insurance, and how much for supplemental cotton. The expense of \$41,944,876 is expense of the county organizations. There is no question about that. That information was furnished by Mr. Wilson of the Agricultural Adjustment Administration for the fiscal year 1941.

Mr. BANKHEAD. The percentage of expense for this program cannot properly be compared with the percentage of expense for any other program because here the administration consists of nearly six and one-half million units which must be visited from time to time throughout the year. The whole administration of the program is totally different from that of any other agency in the Government, because of its far-flung activities, because of the numerous and complex subjects involved, and because of the number of facts that must be developed on each of the more than 6,000,000 farms in order to find, among other things, the amount of parity payments to which each farmer is entitled.

All farmers do not receive the same amount. The payments are based on 5 years' previous production. Those are the records the field agents must obtain. They must bring in the evidence of the amount of production of crops which participate in soil-conservation and parity payments, for each farm, and that in itself is a tremendous task.

In conclusion, I wish to say that this is a legislative question. If this program is to be changed in its administration in any vital or material way, the question should have careful consideration, with hearings properly conducted by the committees charged with this type of legislation. As I have stated, the committees which formulated the program held protracted hearings. The program was the subject of protracted debate, both on the floor of the Senate and on the floor of the House. Now it is the idea of a Member of the Senate that arbitrary reduction should be made in the operating expenses of the Department of Agriculture, and I presume some Senator will put it in the form of an amendment. I submit to the level-headed Members of this body who are interested in the subject of economy that that is not the orderly way to determine what reduction, if any, should be made, and what changes, if any, should be made in the total administration cost of all these agricultural programs.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I think it is the function of the Appropriations Committee, if it thinks the act can be administered by an expenditure of 5 percent rather than 10 percent, to cut the appropriations to accomplish that end. I do not see how the Senator can say that it is not a proper subject for the Appropriations Committee to consider. Of course, if such action

would result in the destruction of the system, I agree with him.

Mr. BANKHEAD. That is what the result would be.

Mr. TAFT. The only question raised by the Senator from Virginia is, If the act can be administered for 5 percent in one State, why not have a limitation of 5 percent in all the States, in the hope of obtaining proper administration of the act, which is obtained in those States where only 5 percent is spent? Why is not that a function of the Appropriations Committee?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, I am not surprised at the attitude of the Senator from Ohio. He has never gone into these agricultural problems. I suspect that he has never gone to the farms and the fields. His interest in and acquaintance with these problems are not the same as those of many Members who have devoted the greater part of their time to the study and investigation of agricultural problems.

I have shown how the program was built up, and how it is based upon statutory requirements. I recognize the Senator from Ohio as one of the ablest men in this body. Whether he is interested in the farmer or not, he is a great man. I respect and like him. However, the Senator must realize the existence of a complicated statutory structure, covering every acre of land in America outside the cities, and embracing nearly 25 percent of the total population of the United States.

The agricultural industry now faces unusual circumstances because of war conditions. In the successful administration of the agricultural programs the Senate cannot afford arbitrarily to change the whole program without hearings, and without a change in the statutory structure. To do so would endanger the production of the food requirements for the coming year.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 73, line 9.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, in order to have a complete statement in the RECORD with respect to the deductions in each State and county, I wish to continue.

In the State of Washington the deduction is 8.1 percent; in West Virginia 18.5 percent; in Wisconsin 7 percent; and in Wyoming 11.8 percent.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have this statement printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks. The statement was obtained from the Agricultural Adjustment Administration. It shows the amount of deduction in each county for administrative expenses, and the percentage thereof of the total payment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Virginia?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, let me say that the investigation which I have made shows that there are numerous misprints in the record which the Senator from Virginia has. For example, in Choctaw County, Ala., the record which the Senator from Virginia has shows a deduction of 1.3 percent.

Mr. BYRD. That record was sent to the Senator from Virginia from the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. RUSSELL. I understand; nevertheless, there are errors in it. I do not claim that the Department of Agriculture is perfection itself in preparing reports.

It also developed that there was an error in the statement with regard to North Dakota. The Senator from North Dakota was very much disturbed by a difference between two counties, which appeared to be due to the decimal point being in the wrong place. I think the statement should be checked. With respect to nine counties in Alabama, reviewing that one State, the decimal point was in the wrong place.

Mr. BYRD. The clerk of the committee informs me that the statement has been corrected by the Department. I shall substitute the corrected statement for the statement which I have just offered.

Mr. RUSSELL. I merely wanted the RECORD to show the facts.

Mr. BYRD. However, let me say that the corrections do not result in any material changes in the State figures as read by the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. WHEELER. I entirely agree with some of the statements of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] with reference to the variation in cost as between certain areas. However, there can be no excuse for the differences in percentage in some of the States. For example, the figure for North Dakota and Montana is 5 percent. When we go over into Wyoming, in practically the same kind of territory, we find a higher cost for administration. As a matter of fact, the farms in Wyoming are larger than those in Montana or North Dakota; and yet we find a much higher percentage.

I am interested in the farm program; but I am also interested in the efficient operation of the program. I say to Members of the Senate that unless the program is operated with efficiency and on a businesslike and systematic basis, sooner or later the Congress will eliminate the program. In my opinion, no one can read the figures in this report without coming to the conclusion that in some States there has been great extravagance and mismanagement, while in other States the program has been managed fairly efficiently.

We are appropriating huge sums of money every year for the Department of Agriculture. Many of the bureaus which have been created in the Department of Agriculture have not been operated efficiently or in the best interests of the people of the country as a whole. If the agricultural program is not operated efficiently, and if the expenses are not cut down, it will be the farmers of the country that will suffer. The people of the United States will not stand for continued inefficiency in the departments.

As I stated before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry the other day, we are in the midst of a war, and we find

ourselves short of alcohol, rubber, starch, sugar, and other vital materials.

We have been appropriating millions upon millions—running into the billions of dollars—for the Department of Agriculture. Yet the Department has not proposed any legislation looking toward a study of the use of various surplus agricultural products for the purpose of converting them into alcohol or synthetic rubber. I am told that the Congress almost had to force upon the Department of Agriculture appropriations for the purpose of building pilot plants to be used for the purpose of experimentation along this line.

In the past 20 years the Department of Agriculture has been asleep at the switch. The only thing it has brought forward has been the idea of paying the farmers not to produce.

For the past 20 years I have been a Member of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. A few years ago representatives of the Department came before the committee and said, "We want to teach the farmers how to make two blades of grass grow where one grows now." We spent millions of dollars of the taxpayers money for that purpose. Then we started to spend money to pay the farmers not to produce.

We pay the farmers not to produce sugar, and we find we are short of sugar. I do not know whether this statement is true, but the other day a very distinguished citizen of my State, who had just returned from Cuba, said that while he was in Cuba he visited some of the warehouses where sugar was stored. He said that there was not room enough in those warehouses for another grain of sugar; and yet we are short of sugar in the United States. The War Production Board has been producing alcohol from molasses derived from sugar. The use of alcohol has been increasing year after year. If the Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to look after the farmers of the country, had not been asleep at the switch it might have worked out some process for using surplus wheat, corn, potatoes, and other things for the purpose of producing alcohol.

If they had worked out these processes we would not now be faced by the problem of the shortage of alcohol, we would not confront the problem of a shortage of sugar, we would not have the problem of the shortage of starch, and we would not be short of a number of other things.

Mr. President, a short time ago we were boasting that we were ready to lick the world; yet all of a sudden we find ourselves short of alcohol, short of rubber, short of transportation, short of everything else under the sun. The situation certainly presents a confusing picture to the American people. Here we are, the richest Nation on the face of this globe, blessed as no other nation under the sun has been blessed by the Creator of all men and of all things; and yet we have to ration gasoline because we are short of transportation; and we have to ration sugar, although our farmers have been pleading for years and years, in my State and elsewhere in the country, for an opportunity to produce more sugar in the United States.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so that I may ask him a question?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Was not the Senator from Montana a member of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, which brought in the sugar bill?

Mr. WHEELER. Yes.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Was not that bill passed at the request of the sugar producers, under the leadership of the late Senator Adams?

Mr. WHEELER. No, indeed; it was not. It was accepted because it was the best they could possibly get through, because of the opposition of the Department of Agriculture and the State Department; and they took it because they had to take it, because it was the best they could get.

Mr. BANKHEAD. They got what they asked for, did they not?

Mr. WHEELER. Oh, no; they did not. It was not what they asked for.

Mr. BANKHEAD. However, they never presented any other bill to Congress, did they?

Mr. WHEELER. Yes; other bills were presented, and a fight was made on the floor of the Senate to get more; but they were told they could not get anything better. They took what they could get, because that was the best they could possibly get under the circumstances.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield to me, let me say that I know the Senator from Montana has a very keen memory; but if any bill has ever been presented here which had the support of the Senators from the sugar-producing States, which was not passed, it was certainly at a time when I was not present.

Mr. WHEELER. Let me say to the Senator that I am quite familiar with the situation regarding sugar.

Mr. RUSSELL. Let me ask the Senator when any such bill was ever defeated on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. WHEELER. It was not defeated on the floor of the Senate; but I repeat that we were definitely told what the program was and what we had to take.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator said that on the floor of the Senate it was stated they could not get a bill through.

Mr. WHEELER. No; if I made that statement, I was in error; I never intended to make such a statement.

Mr. RUSSELL. If there has ever been a bill before the Senate which the sugar producers supported, and which was not passed, I do not know of it.

Mr. WHEELER. We were definitely told that was all we could get, that that was what we had to take. No Senator from a Western State has been entirely satisfied with the sugar legislation which has been passed by the Congress. The Senator knows that in the past 10 years we could not pass sugar legislation through both branches of Congress and have it become a law if the President opposed it. We could not pass it over the veto of the President, so we did the next best thing—we took what we could get.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. HUGHES. The Senator has said, "We were told it could not pass the Congress." I should like to know who told that to the Senator. I simply want to remark in this connection that since I have been a Member of the Senate I have always been ready to vote for any sugar bill which has been proposed.

Mr. WHEELER. We were definitely given to understand by the Department of Agriculture and by the administration that we could not get what we wanted with reference to sugar; and there is not a Senator from a Western State who has not been pleading for larger quotas for sugar. That statement is true with respect to every Senator from the sugar-beet producing areas, and likewise every Senator from the Southern States, in which cane is produced. That has been repeatedly stated.

Mr. HUGHES. I have been ready at all times to vote to enable the farmers of America to produce as much cane sugar and beet sugar as they could produce, and as much as the country needed.

Mr. WHEELER. The Senator may have been willing to do so; but I am sure that the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] and other Senators who have been interested in the sugar problem have known definitely that such a proposal could not be gotten through the Senate, and, of course, could not be finally enacted into law. I do not know of a Senator from a beet-sugar producing State who has not been trying to obtain and who has not repeatedly gone to the Department of Agriculture and asked for larger quotas. We have been asking for them in the last year or so. We have tried to get a sugar factory in the city of Great Falls. We have tried to have a sugar factory located in Miles City, so as to take care of the area there; but we were not permitted to do so. This year the sugar farmers are permitted to raise all the sugar beets they want to raise, but the difficulty is that refineries are not available in which to process the beets.

The State Department has always taken the position that we had to take over so much of the sugar from the Philippine Islands, from Cuba, and other places, in order to placate those countries. They said our foreign policy—whatever that was—demanded that the farmers of America curtail the production of sugar. As a result of this program we are short of sugar.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield again?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. HUGHES. I have heard the Senator's statement. Let me say it is my understanding that at the present time the Government owns all the Cuban sugar. Does it not? Is it not true that we have bought all the Cuban sugar?

Mr. WHEELER. I do not know whether we have bought all of it; but my understanding is that we have an option on it if we have not bought it outright.

Mr. HUGHES. The statement the Senator made, as I understood it, was that there was plenty of sugar there, and that the warehouses were bursting. Did I correctly understand the Senator?



Mr. WHEELER. What I said was that a very distinguished gentleman from my State, a man who is very reliable, has just returned from Cuba within the last 3 weeks, and he told me that the warehouses in Cuba were filled to overflowing with sugar, and that he had visited the various warehouses.

Mr. HUGHES. Does the Senator know of any reason why we should not get that sugar and bring it here?

Mr. WHEELER. I do not; but I say to the Senator that I mean to inquire why that sugar has not been transported to the United States, when we are short of sugar at the present time.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield to me, let me ask him if he does not suppose that Mr. Hitler had a hand in that matter. Have not the shipping facilities been rapidly destroyed?

Mr. WHEELER. Although Mr. Hitler has without a doubt destroyed some of the shipping facilities, I do not think that is a valid excuse for keeping the sugar in Cuba, and not bringing it into the United States. I do not think the situation is so serious from that standpoint. Perhaps I am wrong about that, but I do not believe I am. If that is the case, then certainly we are in a very, very difficult position. If we cannot bring the sugar from Cuba to Florida or to other parts of the United States, then we are in a very difficult position.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me to do so, I should like to interpose at this point to say that it is not a question of lack of ships to convoy the freighters which carry sugar from Cuba to the United States, or which a little earlier were convoying from Hawaii, or even earlier from the Philippines, but it is a question of lack of freighters themselves. Those ships are being used for other purposes, purposes considered more vital than the carrying of sugar.

Mr. WHEELER. The Senator from Michigan may be correct about it so far as the Philippines and the Hawaiian Islands are concerned, but it certainly does not seem to me that we should be short of sugar if there is plenty of sugar in Cuba, and there should be means of bringing the sugar from Cuba to the United States.

The gentleman to whom I have previously referred said, in addition, that the new Cuban sugar crop is coming on, and that the sugar in the warehouses would have to be moved in order that facilities might be afforded in which to store the sugar which is coming on.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I am very glad to yield to the Senator.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Perhaps it is only fair to say that the situation with respect to the Cuban sugar crop is complicated by the fact that there are several uses to which sugar must be put at the present time. In the first place, part of the Cuban crop of necessity has been used in the manufacture of alcohol which is needed in the war program. I was one of those who believed that the War Production Board should have been a good deal

more active than it was in transforming the distillation facilities of the United States so that grain, rather than sugar, would be used for the manufacture of alcohol. I think the conversion was made rather slowly, but it is being made, I am advised, to some extent.

In addition to the amount of sugar needed for the manufacture of industrial alcohol, there is also the amount needed for shipment to Great Britain and to others of the United Nations. Not only is a portion of the Cuban crop being used for the United Nations, that is to say, for Great Britain and also for Russia, but, I am advised, that those who have been handling the lease-lend program have endeavored to make the distribution of the Cuban crop, relatively, upon the basis of the previous record. Before the war a considerable portion of the Cuban crop and of some of the crop from other islands in the Caribbean Sea was used for transportation to Europe. The shipping problem, as the Senator from Michigan [Mr. Brown] has indicated, has made such transportation difficult.

So far as the domestic consumption of sugar is concerned, the Senator from Montana is quite right. Those of us who represent beet-growing States have never been satisfied with the amount of sugar which was allowed to us; we were always asking for a larger quota and we always felt that it seemed a little anomalous, so to speak, that, with the United States unable to produce more than one-third of the amount it consumed, we should not at the same time be expanding the production of sugar beets and sugarcane wherever possible. As the Senator from Montana has already stated, however, the policy of the State Department has been to restrain the expansion of our domestic industry so as to preserve a degree of the offshore industry in Cuba and elsewhere; but when all is said and done, no one, I think, can deny that the Sugar Act has been one of the most successful of all the agricultural acts passed by the Congress. While probably no element of the sugar industry has ever been satisfied with what has been secured under that act, the fact remains that the sugar industry, as a whole, has been tremendously benefited by that act and the interest of the consumer has also been preserved. By and large, it can be said that if one were to take the average of the production of sugar in continental United States during the 3 or 4 years prior to the passage of the so-called Jones-Costigan Act in 1934 and compare it with the production of sugar in continental United States in the last 4 years, he would find that the continental production has been increased by more than 600,000 tons, or in excess of 20 percent, as the Senator from Michigan suggests to me. The beet area has never been actually restricted in terms of acreage except in 1941.

The Senator from Montana, the Senator from Michigan, the Senator from Colorado, myself, and others, in June, a year ago, stood on this floor and predicted the shortage of shipping which now has cut off all our supplies from the Philippines. We urged at that time that any deficit in the amount allotted to the Philippine Islands should be allotted to

the domestic producing area. The Senate of the United States agreed with us; the bill was passed; it went to the House, and there it died; but fairness again compels us to acknowledge that in 1941 the Department of Agriculture probably could not foresee, and certainly few of us thought, that we would be involved in the war as soon as we were, although many of us believed, as the Record at that time will show, that shipping was constantly becoming more and more difficult. Still the fact remains that the year 1941 was the only year under the Sugar Act when the planting of sugar in the West was restricted.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President—

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. WHEELER. I have the floor, but I am glad to yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I beg the Senator's pardon.

Mr. McKELLAR. I merely desire to ask a question for information. Is the unrestricted use of sugar-beet land permitted now?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Oh, yes.

Mr. McKELLAR. Could as many sugar beets be raised as might be desired by those who cultivate them?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. There is not any restriction in effect at all now. That is true also of cane sugar.

Mr. McKELLAR. Is the Senator advised as to what will be the increase of sugar production in the beet-sugar States this year?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It would be very difficult to make a prediction because there are other factors which enter into the situation; for example, lack of agricultural labor, and then the restrictions which have been placed upon the manufacture of farm machinery by the W. P. B. The Senator from Tennessee will be interested, as, I think, all other Senators will, in a case which came to my attention about 3 months ago. About 1938 or 1939 a machinist in the little town of Torrington, Wyo., which is the center of an irrigated area where sugar beets are raised in profusion and where there is a sugar factory, invented what he called a beet loader. In the year 1940 he manufactured and sold 70 of these machines. They were so efficient that a great demand for them arose among the farmers of that area. In 1941 he manufactured and sold 220 of those machines; this year, 1942, he had orders in his shop for more than 500 of them; he had the material in his shop with which to manufacture not fewer than 350; but the restriction order which was issued by the War Production Board limited him to the manufacture of 90 percent of what he manufactured in 1940; so that, with the material in his shop to make not fewer than 350, with the orders on hand, and, in many instances, payment for them already received, he was prevented from making more than 70 machines. I am glad to be able to say that the War Production Board modified that order, and he has been permitted to manufacture, as I recall, 140 or 150; but still the demand cannot be met. That is a circumstance which illustrates the difficulties the beet farmer

must overcome in order to expand his acreage.

Mr. McKELLAR. I should like to ask one more question if the Senator from Montana will permit me.

Mr. WHEELER. Certainly.

Mr. McKELLAR. What I was seeking to ascertain was whether if a tremendous crop of sugar beets should be raised this year, sufficient machinery would be available to extract the sugar from the beets?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Of course, many areas in the West would like to have sugar refineries constructed—that is to say, sugar mills such as the one to which the Senator from Montana was referring. In Montana, in Nebraska, in Wyoming there are great areas in which no such sugar factory has been constructed, and, as a result, the beets have been transported a great distance to the factories, and now, because of priorities, it is impossible to build additional mills.

Mr. McKELLAR. Is there sufficient machinery in the country to extract the sugar from the beets if a good crop shall be raised?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I think it would be possible to process all the beets which might be raised.

I thank the Senator from Montana for permitting me to interrupt him.

Mr. WHEELER. I thank the Senator from Wyoming very much, indeed. I know the Senator from Wyoming has probably given greater study to the sugar question than has any other Member of the Senate. I did not intend to get into the sugar question when I rose, but the situation in the Northwest is that in the irrigation districts, where the land has been irrigated in many instances by the Government, which has succeeded in inducing people to go there and settle, those who have gone there and taken up the land found that during the years of the depression practically the only cash crop they could raise was sugar beets. They wanted to raise sugar beets but they could not raise them because they could not get the refineries.

The refinery interests, as was stated on the floor of the Senate last year, were willing to build, so I am informed, a refinery in the city of Great Falls and also a refinery in another section of the State of Montana to take care of the increased sugar acreage, but they cannot do it unless they are sure that, after they build the refinery, the sugar-beet acreage will not be curtailed again as it was in 1941. They cannot afford to go ahead and build a sugar refinery and then have the Department of Agriculture deprive them of the opportunity of getting sugar beets.

Now, the Department says that the farmer can raise all the sugar beets he wants to, but the trouble is the farmer cannot find a place where he can have his sugar beets processed, because there are no factories in the particular district and they cannot afford to ship the beets long distances in order that they may be processed. The Department comes along now and says, "You can raise all the sugar beets you want to." The trouble is that the farmer cannot find a place where his sugar beets may be processed, because there are no factories in that particular district, and they cannot af-

ford to ship the beets the long distance necessary to reach a refinery.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Montana yield to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. BROWN. I think the Senator puts his finger on a very vital matter. We have to make some sort of a legislative and administrative determination of the very question he raises, whether or not we are to permit the construction of additional sugar-beet and sugarcane refineries.

The situation in Florida well illustrates the condition. There is no question that the United States Sugar Beet Corporation could produce a tremendous additional amount of sugar in Florida if they knew that the policy of the Government would be such as would permit the continued production of sugar in the years after the war. I think the industry is in a very unstable condition because of the uncertainty of what is to be the policy. I am glad the Senator from Montana has called attention to the question, because I believe those of us who have constituents who are interested should get together and seek some solution of the problem; determine whether the sugar policy is to be the policy of 1932 to 1940, or whether we are to permit the addition of a great many sugar beet processing plants, and whether we are to permit the expansion of the sugarcane industry in Florida, in Louisiana, and at other places.

Mr. WHEELER. I thank the Senator. Along that line, as I stated a moment ago, I am informed by leading members of the chamber of commerce in the city of Great Falls that refining interests came there and said, "We are willing to come in and build a sugar refinery provided we can have some assurance that we can get the sugar beets to process in the refinery for 3 or 4 years." As I recall, it was 3 or 4 years; I forget the exact length of time. They could not get any assurance, so some of us went to the Department of Agriculture to see if we could not get some assurance there, but they could not give us any. Now they say, "Of course, you can go ahead and produce all the sugar beets you want to produce," but we cannot get a refining company to put up a refinery unless they know they can operate it for at least 4 or 5 years. Secondly, they cannot get priorities on materials now, because the steel is needed in other activities.

Go to a large group of farmers in the Northwest, who desire to produce sugar beets, and, when they are facing an economic depression and are being driven off their farms, and their places are being sold under mortgages, try to explain to them how we have to buy sugar from the Philippines and from Cuba and from other countries, and that we will not permit American farmers, who are losing their farms, and whose families are being driven off the farms, to grow sugar, because of the policy of the State Department in Washington. It is said we have to take care of the Cubans, but these American farmers would say, "After all, we are the ones

who pay the taxes in this country, we are the ones who build the homes and schools and the churches here, and we are the ones, here in the United States, this country should look after, before it looks after some other people."

There is no member of the Senate who can go to those farmers, when their mortgages are about to be foreclosed and they are going to be driven off their farms, when their farms are being sold for taxes, and say to them, "We have to do this because we have to protect the Philippine Islands, or some other place."

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. HUGHES. I have no personal interest, nor have my constituents, in the sugar-producing business, because we produce neither sugar beets nor sugarcane in my State, nor do we refine sugar. I am rather interested in the subject, however, having come in contact with it first in Louisiana, and later in Florida, and still later when I was in the West.

I learned in Florida that the people there could produce a vast amount of sugar, but they do not have a refinery in the State, the nearest refinery being in Georgia, an adjoining State. It takes about 2 years, after the cuttings are put in, to raise a crop of cane. Then the cane would be taken to Georgia, and the refining done there. I think the same situation prevails in Louisiana. I do not think there is a refinery there, from what I have understood, but they can produce a great quantity of sugar in that State. They could produce much sugar to meet our needs if they were given the opportunity.

It would require an expenditure of a sizable sum of money to plant the sugarcane, to grow it to maturity, and to have refineries built; and the people in Florida and Louisiana, like those in the West to whom the Senator has referred, hesitate to go into that line of business unless they have assurance that it will continue, and will justify the investment of money. I found the same condition in the West when I made inquiry there.

I have always felt that it was a very unusual condition for the people of a country to be able to produce a commodity in quite sufficient quantity to take care of the needs of its own people, and yet not be allowed to do it, making us dependent on an uncertain supply from a distant source. For that reason, as I stated a while ago, I early became convinced that those who want to grow sugar beets and those who want to grow sugarcane in this country should be permitted to do so, to take their sugar to the market, and to sell it to our people.

I understand the argument about our having to take care of the Philippines and to take Cuba into consideration. Of course, we know the Philippines are out of the picture at this time, so far as the supply of sugar is concerned, but we are told that the warehouses in Cuba are bursting with a large supply of sugar, while we are rationing our people. We do not get the sugar from Cuba, although we have an option on it. Why is that sugar not brought in?



Mr. WHEELER. I must confess that when I was told about the sugar supply in Cuba—and, as I have stated, the statement was made to me by an exceedingly reputable man from my State—I was astounded, and could hardly believe it. If it had come to me from almost any other source I would not have believed it.

Mr. HUGHES. I should be willing to see steps taken to give our people assurance that if they went into sugar production they would not lose by it, that they would not be shut off later on. I have been ready to vote for such legislation, and whenever an opportunity has been afforded to do so, I have seized the opportunity.

Mr. WHEELER. I thank the Senator. As I have said, we find ourselves in the same situation in regard to other products. We find ourselves short of copper; we find ourselves short of manganese; but away back in 1933 I took up with the War Department and the Navy Department the matter of the supply of those necessary metals, urging them, when they were putting miners on the W. P. A. rolls at \$56 a month, to buy copper, which was selling at that time for 5 cents a pound, and put it in a stock pile and keep it for defense purposes. I made the same suggestion in reference to manganese. In all fairness to the Navy Department and the War Department, both were anxious to put in a stock pile of manganese, but we were never able to get anything done about it.

I think the time is coming when our people are going to have to look to their own efforts, and produce everything they can produce here in the United States, rather than depend upon some other country. As the Senator from Wyoming has said, many of us from the Western States have time and time again pointed out that if anything should happen, if war should break out between the United States and the Japanese, the Philippine sugar supply would be cut off, and that consequently it was necessary, for our own protection, that we permit the farmers of this country to produce in the United States, as they could produce it, the sugar our people need.

If we had developed our manganese mines in 1933 to the extent to which we should have developed them, we would not now find ourselves short of manganese; and the same is true as to copper. We would have had stock piles of copper in the United States, and we would not have had to depend upon other countries for either copper or manganese. Of course it is easy to look back now and say what should have been done.

Mr. President, what I rose to say was that it is all very well to stand on the floor of the Senate and say that we should not legislate on an appropriation bill with respect to this matter; but if the farmers of the United States must depend upon the Congress of the United States for appropriations year after year they will not receive them unless the farm program is carried out in the most businesslike and economical way possible. All sorts of excuses can be found for the present way of handling the program, but I cannot understand why there

should be such a tremendous variance between the cost in one State compared with the cost in another State. It may cost more in a State which contains many small farms than it does in a State where the farms are large; but when we find great disparity in costs of administering the program in adjoining States it is hard to understand why that difference should exist. In my opinion, such differences should not exist. I am afraid there has been too much laxity in the administration of the law. I ask the Senator from Virginia what the figure of cost for the State of Rhode Island is?

Mr. BYRD. Twenty percent.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. HUGHES. I saw for a moment a copy of the table to which the Senator from Virginia referred, and naturally I looked at the figure for the State of Delaware and compared it with a State farther up the coast, Connecticut. The cost in Delaware was 5.9 percent and the cost in Connecticut 10 percent. In other words, the cost is about 5 percent higher in Connecticut than in Delaware. Why does that difference exist? I do not understand it.

Mr. WHEELER. The cost in the State of Rhode Island is 20.6 percent—Bristol County, 25 percent; Kent County, 21 percent; Newport County, 21 percent; Providence County, 18 percent; Washington County, 17 percent.

I see that the cost in South Carolina is 6.4 percent.

I shall mention certain counties in the State of Tennessee. Anderson County, 21 percent; Bedford County, 7 percent; Benton County, 17 percent. The cost runs as high as 27 percent in other counties.

Mr. McKELLAR. What is the average for Tennessee?

Mr. WHEELER. The average for Tennessee is 12 percent.

I look at the figures for the State of Texas. Certainly the farms in Texas are not small ones. In some counties the cost runs as high as 22 percent.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. President, will the Senator again yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. HUGHES. The cost in the State of Connecticut is 10.3 percent, whereas in the State of Delaware it is 5.9 percent. Why does such a difference exist?

Mr. WHEELER. I cannot answer the question. In Utah the cost is 11 percent, whereas in the State of Montana it is 5 percent. The farms in the States of Montana and Utah are in practically the same category. The cost in the State of Virginia is 15 percent. I do not know why it should cost 15 percent in Virginia when it costs less than 6 percent in the State of Delaware.

Mr. HUGHES. We are more economical in Delaware than they are in Virginia.

Mr. WHEELER. The cost in the State of Oregon is 10.3 percent. In Pennsylvania it is 12 percent. Pennsylvania is one of the large farming States of the East, and its cost is 12 percent, whereas the cost in the State of Rhode Island is 20 percent. The cost in the State of

Oklahoma is 6.7 percent, and in Ohio 9.3 percent. The cost in North Dakota is 5.1 percent. It seems to me the farmers in Montana, where the cost is 5 percent, must be a more honest class than those in the East in States where the cost is 15 percent, 18 percent, and 20 percent. I have always contended that our people in the West were a little more intelligent than those in some of the Eastern States, without specifying any particular State.

Mr. HUGHES. Does the Senator think that all those constituting the "economy bloc" from Virginia have come to the Capitol and that none are left at home? [Laughter.]

Mr. WHEELER. In New Jersey the cost is 10 percent, in New Hampshire 14 percent, and in Nevada 15 percent. Certainly there are no small farms in the State of Nevada. In Nebraska the cost is 7 percent. The explanation given on the floor of the Senate of the wide divergence in the various percentages of cost certainly does not make sense to me.

The cost in one county in Montana runs as high as 21 percent. I know that county very well. In another county in Montana the cost runs as high as 52 percent. There is no excuse for the cost running as high as 52 percent in any county.

Mr. RUSSELL. What was the total amount paid in the county where the cost is 52 percent?

Mr. WHEELER. Gross payments \$7,630. Association expense \$4,000.

Mr. RUSSELL. What county was that?

Mr. WHEELER. That was in Lincoln County.

Mr. RUSSELL. And what State?

Mr. WHEELER. Montana.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is the highest percentage I have heard of.

Mr. WHEELER. It is 52 percent. There certainly is something wrong with the association or with someone when the charge for association expenses is \$4,000 out of the \$7,630 paid to the farmers. In another county in the same State the total payment is \$189,000, with \$9,000 paid out in association expenses, or 4 percent.

In St. Louis County, Mo., the cost is 33 percent. In a county in the State of Michigan the cost is 37 percent. There the gross payments were \$4,000 and association benefits \$1,500. In another county the cost is 44 percent, \$8,700 being the gross payments, and \$3,867 going to the association.

Mr. President, no one can convince me that there is not something wrong when such conditions are not checked up and stopped by the Department of Agriculture. Sooner or later the people of the United States will cease to stand for such conditions and the whole agricultural program will break down. Those of us who are interested in the farm program cannot come to Congress and ask for appropriations of millions of dollars to help the farmers, when in some counties 50 percent goes into the expense of distributing the money, in other counties 40 percent, and in other counties 33 percent. Think of a cost of \$4,000 to distribute \$7,000 gross payments.

Mr. President, there is something "rotten in Denmark" when such a condition is permitted to continue. Whether the condition exists in my State or in some other State, I say there is no excuse for such a high percentage of cost. A variance of from 20 percent in the State of Rhode Island to less than 6 percent in Delaware is something which cannot easily be explained away. I do not believe any Senator can justify such a variance.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I will say to the Senator from Montana that I am not familiar with the sugar situation, but it happens that the Senate Committee on Military Affairs has before it two bills dealing with the rubber situation. One is a bill offered by the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS] proposing to prohibit the operation of a motor car in excess of 40 miles an hour and providing that the car shall be forfeited to the Government for violation of the prohibition. The other bill is the bill of the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] providing that the Government shall be given the power to requisition private cars for the purpose of taking them over and acquiring the rubber that may be in the tires on the cars. The Senate Committee on Military Affairs has had a number of hearings on those bills and on the question of rubber. As the result of the hearings I was interested in ascertaining just what was the record so far as rubber was concerned, and what had been done by the Government, and more particularly by the Department of Agriculture, with respect to rubber and a rubber supply. I find from the record that the Department of Agriculture has been working for some time in an effort to free us from our dependence on the East Indies in the matter of rubber. The fact is that the Department of Agriculture, when the distinguished Vice President first became Secretary of Agriculture, laid down a program looking toward providing a supply of rubber.

The program was divided into four parts: First, encouragement of the production of natural rubber in Latin America; second, encouragement of the production of natural rubber in the United States; third, development of synthetic rubber in the United States; and fourth, building up a rubber stock pile against the day of need.

Through the years former Secretary WALLACE sought to carry out that program, and came to Congress not once, but a number of times, in an effort to obtain appropriations looking toward the fulfillment of the program. In many instances the money was denied. In some cases the money was granted. In one or two instances in which the House had denied funds the Senate granted at least a part of the funds requested.

I think the position of the Department was perhaps best summarized by a statement which the Secretary of Agriculture made, and which appeared in the New York Times under date of July 9, 1939. The then Secretary WALLACE voiced these views:

It would seem wise for the Americas to begin to plan at once for the gradual asser-

tion of rubber independence. It will be a slow job because in Latin America they have what is known as the South American leaf spot disease, which is absent in the rubber-growing sections of the East Indies; but by using scientific methods it will undoubtedly be possible to develop in Latin America strains of rubber plants which are both high-yielding and disease-resistant. This will require the utmost cooperation between Latin American people and resources and North American science and capital, but the job can and will be done to the satisfaction of all concerned within a few years after the will to do it definitely appears.

As I have said, we find from the record that prior to that statement the Secretary had appeared before various committees of Congress, including the Appropriations Committees. For example, on June 7, 1938, the Secretary appeared before a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Appropriations and discussed the question of rubber. He made a plea for funds with which the Department might carry on its program.

On April 10, 1939, we find the Secretary again before the Appropriations Committee of the Senate with another plea for funds to carry forward this program in an effort to free us from our dependence for rubber supply on the East Indies, so that we might have a supply of rubber within the Western Hemisphere, and, so far as possible, within the United States itself.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me to interrupt him, when the plea was made, was it for money to build plants to produce alcohol from grains, and then convert it into synthetic rubber?

Mr. HILL. One of the programs was for the development of synthetic rubber.

Mr. WHEELER. How much was asked for that purpose?

Mr. HILL. I do not know that I can give the Senator the break-down of the figures; but I know that one phase of the program was the development of synthetic rubber, bearing in mind, as the Senator well knows, that in order to produce synthetic rubber a certain amount of natural rubber is necessary. It is necessary to have a certain amount of natural rubber in combination with the synthetic rubber produced from alcohol, petroleum, or any other source of supply for synthetic rubber.

The record clearly shows that the Department of Agriculture has been working for some years in an effort to make us independent of the supply of rubber in the East Indies in order that the Western Hemisphere, and more particularly the United States, might be independent.

I am sure the Senator will recall that several years ago the Department of Agriculture, working in conjunction with the distinguished then Senator from South Carolina, Mr. Byrnes, and Mr. Baruch, of New York, put through a trade deal by which we exchanged cotton for rubber, as one effort to try to build up the stock pile which the Department said we should have—at least a 2-year supply. So the Department of Agriculture certainly has been diligent in its efforts to give us an independent supply of rubber in order that we might

not be forced to depend upon the East Indies.

Mr. WHEELER. I am glad to have the Senator give me those facts. However, I happen to be a member of the Gillette committee, which is studying this question. We have had before us numerous experts, as well as representatives of the Department of Agriculture, including the Secretary of Agriculture. The only thing that has been done by the Department of Agriculture has been done by a pilot plant which was established only a few years ago, at the insistence of certain Senators who introduced bills appropriating money for pilot plants. As I understand, four such plants are now in operation.

Mr. HILL. I think we established four agricultural laboratories. One was at New Orleans, and three in various other places.

Mr. WHEELER. One is in California and one at Peoria, Ill.

Mr. HILL. As the Senator suggested, the idea was to conduct experiments at one of those plants looking toward the production of synthetic rubber.

Mr. WHEELER. That is correct. According to the testimony before our committee, the pilot plant in Illinois has worked out a process by which we could develop synthetic rubber in the United States. The Senator from Vermont and the Senator from Nebraska are members of that committee. We have had experts from various universities before the committee. We have seen the letters which have been written to the O. P. M. by the University of Nebraska, or the State of Nebraska, and by the State of Idaho, asking for materials. They already had practically 90 percent of the materials. They wanted to go ahead and build plants for the production of alcohol from which synthetic rubber could be produced; but they received no help and were turned down flatly by the O. P. M.

Mr. HILL. The record which I was discussing was the record of the Department of Agriculture. As to the O. P. M., I have had the rubber question up with the O. P. M. In my State of Alabama there was a concern which was interested in entering upon the production of synthetic rubber. I pursued the matter as diligently as I could. I found that the reason the O. P. M. could not go forward with the synthetic plants was that the construction of synthetic plants required a great amount of steel. That is the information which was given to me.

Mr. WHEELER. Let me correct the Senator. The production of synthetic rubber from gasoline requires much more steel than is used when it is produced from grain. That is the evidence before our committee. I am sorry the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] is not present, because he has the facts at his fingertips. We have had hearings, and the evidence has been brought out. We have had experts from the O. P. M. and from the R. F. C., and they have all admitted that less steel is required to build a plant for the production of alcohol from grain than for the production of alcohol from gasoline or oil. However, the materials are not available. The production has been turned over to the oil companies, rather than to plants in the Middle West



where corn and other grains are produced.

Mr. HILL. Perhaps the plants for making synthetic rubber from petroleum had already been established before the plea was made to make it from corn. The Senator may know more about that subject than I do.

Mr. WHEELER. I think the Senator is in error.

Mr. HILL. Perhaps I am. The O. P. M. may feel that, although less steel would be required for a plant producing synthetic rubber from corn than by a plant producing synthetic rubber from petroleum, all the steel which now is available for synthetic-rubber production has already been allocated or put in use. We have only a certain amount of steel available. There is a tremendous demand for steel for ships, tanks, guns, and many other things which we need to win the war. That being the case, only a certain proportion of the available steel can be used for the production of synthetic rubber. I am wondering whether the part which can be allocated for the production of synthetic rubber has not already been allocated and whether that is the reason we cannot go further with the construction of rubber plants, whether they be plants to produce synthetic rubber from corn, petroleum, or any other source.

Mr. WHEELER. The Senator is not familiar with the facts, because the facts are not in accord with his statement if the testimony before our committee is correct.

Mr. HILL. What is the testimony before the Senator's committee?

Mr. WHEELER. The testimony before the committee—and I hope the Senator from Nebraska will correct me if I am in error—is that the University of Nebraska and other agencies in that State have been asking for allocations for material for a long time. They were turned down flatly. I am told that, as a matter of fact, they have practically all the material. A plant in Philadelphia has been asking for material. It has been turned down, and allocations have been made to other places.

Mr. HILL. Did the Philadelphia plant use the corn method?

Mr. WHEELER. The grain method. It is not produced entirely from corn, but from corn, wheat, and other grains.

Mr. HILL. As I have said, I am not familiar with the story of the O. P. M. However, I did wish to call attention to the record so far as the Department of Agriculture is concerned, and the efforts of the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. WHEELER. I wish to be fair with the O. P. M. The testimony shows that it probably would cost more at the present time to produce alcohol from grain than from gasoline; but the main point which it seems to me should be taken into consideration is that we have surplus grains on hand while we are short of sugar. While the process is still in an experimental stage, the R. F. C. experts testified that the process is a good process, and is being used, and could be used more extensively. When there is a transportation shortage, it would be cheaper and easier to have the alcohol manufactured in factories in the Middle West,

where the grain is produced, and then shipped east, rather than to ship the raw materials to the East. In addition, the evidence showed that there are by-products from the grain which could be used on the farms in the West and in the Middle West for the feeding of cattle.

There is much confusion with respect to rubber. One day we find someone issuing a statement to the effect that there is not a shortage of rubber, and the next day we find someone issuing a statement to the effect that there is a decided shortage of rubber; so I think the people of the country are extremely confused. However, I repeat what I said about the Department of Agriculture. In my judgment the Department of Agriculture has not been on the job. If it had been on the job it would have been here asking the Congress for appropriations for these purposes. It seems to me it would have come before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, of which I have been a member for 20 years, and asked for such legislation. I do not remember that anyone ever came before the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and asked for such legislation or ever pointed out the need for legislation to permit the use of this country's surplus grains for the purpose of making alcohol, starches, synthetic rubber, or anything else.

In the last 4 years the four pilot plants which have been established have done a very excellent job so far as they have gone. I think the men in charge of the pilot plant at Peoria, particularly, have done excellent work. I have forgotten the name of the town in California where one of the plants is located; but I think the men in charge of the plant there are doing a very remarkable job. They are not only discovering one or two uses to which various grains and grasses can be put, but are manufacturing articles in the production of which they are using surplus grains, and I am told by the experts there that they have made some really exceptional discoveries with respect to the use of such grains.

Mr. HILL. I wish to say to the Senator, as I have previously stated, that I do not know particularly about the manufacture of such articles from grain; but, as I have said, the record clearly shows that the Department of Agriculture and, more particularly, the then Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. WALLACE, was appearing before the Appropriations Committees of Congress as far back as 1937, 1938, 1939, and 1940, seeking funds in order that the Department might carry out its program, a fourfold program as I have said, one for the production in this country of natural rubber, the production in South America of natural rubber, the production of synthetic rubber, and the accumulation of a stock pile. During all those years, as the record will show—and I have referred to certain dates—the then Secretary of Agriculture appeared before the various Appropriations Committees of the Congress seeking funds in behalf of that very program.

Mr. WHEELER. I shall appreciate it very much if the Senator will later call my attention to the appearance of any-

one before the Appropriations Committees—

Mr. HILL. I will call the Senator's attention to it right now.

Mr. WHEELER. I ask the Senator to permit me to finish my question, because I am sure the Senator cannot understand my question until I finish it.

Mr. HILL. Very well.

Mr. WHEELER. I am sure the Senator does not know what I am going to ask him until I have finished asking the question.

Mr. HILL. Does not the Senator sometimes engage in mental telepathy? [Laughter.]

Mr. WHEELER. No.

Mr. HILL. Very well.

Mr. WHEELER. I should like to be shown the testimony of anyone who has asked for money—and I should like to know how much money has been requested—for the construction of plants to manufacture either alcohol or rubber from grain. That is what I was discussing. I was not discussing requests for appropriations of money with which to develop the production of rubber in South America, Central America, or Mexico.

Mr. HILL. Or in the United States.

Mr. WHEELER. I was talking about the development of factories for the production of industrial alcohol in the United States, for the purpose of using up the surplus grains, and also for the purpose of making rubber and other articles of that kind. I am not nearly so much interested in such production in South America; but I and a number of other Senators from the Middle West and the West have for a long time been vitally interested in the development of the use of grains in the manufacture of various articles in the United States. I am convinced that such uses can be developed, and can be made of great benefit to the farmers of this country, and that we can use surplus grains in the manufacture of various vital commodities needed by the people of the United States.

I think that is one of the matters which the Department of Agriculture should take into consideration, and must take into consideration in the immediate future. If that had been done in the past we should not now find ourselves short of alcohol and rubber, because we should have rubber plants which would have been developing synthetic rubber in the United States.

Other countries have established such plants; but instead of doing so ourselves, we have depended upon the East Indies; we have depended upon England; and we have depended upon the rubber trust. All of a sudden we find ourselves cut off. Today we find that we are operating on an economy based upon rubber. The supply of rubber cannot be cut off overnight without causing chaos in this country. The farmers of the country are dependent upon rubber. The operation of their machinery is dependent upon rubber. The farmers depend upon rubber in order to get their products from the farms to the elevators. They are dependent upon rubber, particularly in my section and in the Middle West, where

sometimes they live 30 or 40 miles from a railroad, and have no wagons or busses to use. They must use automobiles. If, overnight, their supply of tires and other rubber products is cut off, we shall find a decrease in the production of grain and other food supplies all over the United States.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me further?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I believe the Senator said that at the Northern Regional Research Laboratory, since the establishment of that laboratory, experiments had been carried on for the production of rubber from grain. Of course, that work has been carried on by the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. WHEELER. That is correct; and in my judgment those experimental stations have done very excellent work.

Mr. HILL. Yes.

Mr. WHEELER. The only trouble is that they were created only in the past 4 years. I do not know whether it is true, but the other day someone stated before the committee that these research laboratories were forced upon the Department of Agriculture. I do not know whether that statement is correct.

Mr. HILL. I do not think it is correct, because, as I very distinctly remember, the Department of Agriculture supported the establishment of those laboratories.

Mr. WHEELER. I am not sure about that.

Mr. HILL. I think there is no question that the Department of Agriculture supported the establishment of those laboratories. As the Senator says, that bill was introduced by a Member of this body. It had to be introduced by a Member of this body, because, of course, the departments do not introduce bills. However, I am sure that if the Senator will examine the record he will find that the bill providing for the establishment of those regional laboratories had the wholehearted support of the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. WHEELER. I hope the Senator is correct. Of course, I have simply repeated—and perhaps I should not have done so—what a distinguished Member of this body said to me the other day with reference to that matter; but I have not had time to check the record. However, that is not material.

Those three or four laboratories are doing a very fine work. I want to see them expanded, because I think that such activity is one of the most essential and important things the Department of Agriculture can engage in for the benefit of the future development of the farms of the United States.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield to me, I merely wish to make a unanimous consent request in connection with an amendment. On April 27, I gave notice of a motion to suspend the rule in order that I might offer a certain amendment to the agricultural appropriation bill. I now find that I should change the total amount stated in the amendment, by reducing the amount approximately \$6,000,000. So I ask unanimous consent that I may reduce the amount stated in the amend-

ment, and may have the notice applied to it: Namely, on line 5, to strike out \$53,000,000, and insert in lieu thereof \$46,949,756.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Wisconsin? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment on page 73, line 9.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I have now received the corrected statement from the Department of Agriculture with respect to the payment of the Agricultural Adjustment Administration, which I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

I wish to say that the corrections are inconsequential, most of them relating to the decimal point not being correctly placed in the figures as to some of the counties. The percentages of the State payments have not been changed. These figures relate to payments, by counties, in the State of Alabama, the State of Arizona, the State of Arkansas, and several other States.

I ask unanimous consent that the statement be inserted in the body of the RECORD, and I should like to have the Senator from Georgia, if he cares to do so, examine it. It has come from the Department of Agriculture, but the corrections are more or less inconsequential, and do not affect any of the State totals.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the statement will be printed.

The statement is as follows:

*Gross payments to farmers and County Agricultural Conservation Association expenses, 1940 conservation program*

ALABAMA			
County	Gross payments	Association expense	Percent expense is of payments
Autauga	\$162,856	\$14,003	8.6
Baldwin	68,142	11,216	16.4
Barbour	203,207	39,204	9.4
Bibb	77,040	12,459	16.2
Blount	237,611	15,266	6.4
Bullock	136,250	13,358	9.8
Butler	184,026	13,729	7.5
Calhoun	159,917	15,407	8.3
Chambers	185,641	12,558	6.8
Cherokee	240,536	12,724	5.3
Chilton	156,581	12,545	8.0
Choctaw	99,875	12,435	13.0
Clarke	126,870	14,188	11.8
Clay	106,008	11,913	11.4
Cleburne	79,179	8,468	10.6
Coffee	219,678	15,584	7.1
Colbert	177,946	15,787	8.8
Conecuh	153,233	13,236	8.7
Cook	72,492	11,654	16.0
Covington	231,323	16,570	7.2
Crenshaw	184,294	14,508	7.9
Cullman	414,638	27,985	6.7
Dale	128,914	14,590	11.3
Dallas	297,365	17,835	6.0
De Kalb	308,903	21,614	5.7
Elmore	249,715	18,244	7.3
Escambia	134,539	14,714	11.0
Etowah	202,629	14,656	7.2
Fayette	141,441	13,790	9.8
Franklin	184,986	17,988	9.7
Geneva	223,300	15,134	6.8
Greene	134,637	13,736	10.2
Hale	218,041	12,167	5.6
Henry	183,618	10,360	5.6
Houston	305,014	18,100	5.9
Jackson	206,101	21,529	8.1
Jefferson	71,625	13,237	18.4
Lamar	109,234	12,177	7.2
Lauderdale	288,571	26,338	9.2
Lawrence	283,117	17,627	6.2
Lee	167,609	11,045	6.6
Limestone	405,952	21,947	5.4
Lowndes	162,100	15,278	9.4
Macon	208,325	17,067	8.2

*Gross payments to farmers and County Agricultural Conservation Association expenses, 1940 conservation program—Continued*

ALABAMA—continued			
County	Gross payments	Association expense	Percent expense is of payments
Madison	\$472,966	\$25,111	5.3
Marengo	240,455	17,583	7.3
Marion	165,346	16,014	9.7
Marshall	375,056	20,933	5.6
Mobile	59,163	9,605	16.3
Monroe	235,878	19,597	8.3
Montgomery	183,899	16,223	8.8
Morgan	294,937	19,557	6.6
Perry	192,180	15,404	8.0
Pickens	224,026	19,136	8.5
Pike	238,920	11,975	5.0
Randolph	172,495	15,265	8.8
Russell	143,655	14,086	10.4
St. Clair	115,734	11,258	9.7
Shelby	90,882	8,287	9.1
Sumter	174,755	16,041	9.2
Talladega	223,405	18,333	8.2
Tallapoosa	168,294	16,659	9.9
Tuscaloosa	229,573	22,820	9.9
Walker	109,550	15,222	13.9
Washington	42,684	7,610	17.8
Wilcox	164,292	12,751	7.8
Winston	110,291	12,631	10.9
Total or average	12,914,355	1,036,361	8.0

ARIZONA			
County	Gross payments	Association expense	Percent expense is of payments
Apache	\$83,535	\$6,485	7.8
Cochise	73,537	5,052	6.9
Coconino	43,143	2,527	5.9
Gila	20,329	2,049	10.1
Graham	142,717	6,492	4.5
Greenlee	14,808	2,264	15.3
Maricopa	944,655	24,889	2.6
Mohave	51,747	4,634	9.0
Navajo	52,879	1,941	3.7
Pima	82,396	3,578	4.3
Pinal	374,028	11,924	3.2
Santa Cruz	10,997	575	5.2
Yavapai	74,940	3,843	5.1
Yuma	137,649	3,498	2.5
Total or average	2,107,360	79,751	3.8

ARKANSAS			
County	Gross payments	Association expense	Percent expense is of payments
Arkansas	220,437	9,736	4.4
Ashley	219,883	8,317	3.8
Baxter	33,187	4,012	12.1
Benton	173,324	4,465	2.6
Boone	82,119	4,532	5.5
Bradley	85,739	6,392	7.5
Calhoun	68,137	5,100	7.5
Carroll	89,758	4,308	4.9
Chicot	307,528	10,144	3.3
Clark	135,456	6,758	5.0
Clay	308,898	11,691	3.8
Cleburne	91,370	5,937	6.5
Cleveland	107,525	7,339	6.8
Columbia	223,327	11,632	5.2
Conway	188,398	8,018	4.2
Craighead	506,641	15,481	3.0
Crawford	95,549	5,175	5.4
Crittenden	678,616	15,202	2.2
Cross	280,606	11,694	4.2
Dallas	54,988	5,499	10.0
Desha	288,163	9,078	3.1
Drew	138,328	7,900	5.7
Faulkner	231,697	8,945	3.9
Franklin	99,345	5,256	5.3
Fulton	65,383	4,387	6.7
Garland	30,131	5,155	17.1
Grant	46,405	5,060	11.0
Greene	265,630	10,166	3.8
Hempstead	222,910	11,602	5.2
Hot Spring	62,513	4,397	7.0
Howard	113,752	6,798	6.0
Independence	150,532	9,187	6.0
Izard	93,865	4,499	4.8
Jackson	288,646	14,308	4.9
Jefferson	447,557	13,485	3.0
Johnson	111,919	5,284	4.7
Lafayette	167,514	7,680	4.6
Lawrence	198,137	9,708	5.0
Lee	330,670	13,803	4.2
Lincoln	252,467	11,890	4.7
Little River	118,034	6,542	5.5
Logan	137,411	7,432	5.4
Lonoke	372,362	14,441	3.9
Madison	71,140	3,796	5.3
Marion	44,619	4,680	10.5
Miller	190,883	9,885	5.2
Mississippi	1,418,213	31,687	2.2
Monroe	205,164	11,628	5.8
Montgomery	38,513	4,365	11.3
Nevada	144,728	7,305	5.0
Newton	27,245	4,148	15.2



Gross payments to farmers and County Agricultural Conservation Association expenses, 1940 conservation program—Continued

## ARKANSAS—continued

County	Gross payments	Association expense	Percent expense is of payments
Ouachita.....	\$82,162	\$8,555	10.4
Perry.....	58,894	5,779	9.8
Phillips.....	441,865	10,990	2.5
Pike.....	63,550	5,218	8.0
Poinsett.....	464,254	15,020	3.2
Polk.....	46,644	5,012	10.7
Pope.....	171,196	6,911	4.0
Prairie.....	123,051	10,258	8.3
Pulaski.....	237,236	8,455	3.6
Randolph.....	141,089	8,048	5.7
St. Francis.....	425,481	18,566	4.4
Saline.....	37,443	5,386	14.0
Scott.....	63,492	5,823	9.2
Searcy.....	33,148	4,364	13.2
Sebastian.....	96,243	5,472	5.7
Sevier.....	64,750	4,666	7.2
Sharp.....	78,873	5,911	7.5
Stone.....	26,699	3,995	15.0
Union.....	129,143	8,328	6.4
Van Buren.....	92,790	5,328	5.7
Washington.....	140,989	5,958	4.2
White.....	307,069	13,277	4.3
Woodruff.....	245,941	9,397	3.8
Yell.....	169,365	8,455	5.0
Total or average.....	14,066,933	625,441	4.4

## CALIFORNIA

Alameda.....	\$49,829	\$8,200	16.5
Alpine.....	624	268	42.9
Amador.....	10,413	2,526	24.3
Butte.....	204,178	18,077	8.9
Calaveras.....	7,052	1,921	27.2
Colusa.....	201,289	15,302	7.6
Contra Costa.....	86,122	16,216	18.8
Del Norte.....	3,588	1,459	40.7
Eldorado.....	10,406	2,649	25.5
Fresno.....	1,024,895	73,798	7.2
Glenn.....	153,702	12,681	8.3
Humboldt.....	48,047	8,989	18.7
Imperial.....	295,977	26,313	8.9
Inyo.....	1,261	434	34.4
Kern.....	809,770	50,208	6.2
Kings.....	462,334	29,074	6.3
Lake.....	23,927	7,149	29.9
Lassen.....	30,864	6,482	21.0
Los Angeles.....	190,616	29,790	15.6
Madera.....	510,339	25,196	4.9
Marin.....	11,668	2,219	19.0
Mariposa.....	7,951	1,824	22.9
Mendocino.....	67,608	10,961	16.2
Merced.....	439,931	38,054	8.6
Modoc.....	38,846	5,721	14.7
Mono.....	1,354	9,961	35.1
Monterey.....	110,545	10,849	17.2
Napa.....	63,067	1,050	27.6
Nevada.....	160,533	25,243	15.7
Orange.....	66,129	7,022	10.6
Placer.....	4,190	1,424	34.0
Plumas.....	206,466	46,373	22.5
Riverside.....	162,833	17,174	10.5
Sacramento.....	70,945	7,126	10.0
San Benito.....	176,317	26,800	15.3
San Bernardino.....	161,448	41,823	25.9
San Diego.....	305,501	41,022	13.4
San Joaquin.....	118,978	15,988	13.4
San Luis Obispo.....	24,657	4,882	19.8
Santa Barbara.....	69,311	8,077	11.7
Santa Clara.....	186,154	21,181	11.4
Santa Cruz.....	39,719	6,988	17.6
Shasta.....	20,193	4,259	21.1
Sierra.....	1,566	743	47.4
Siskiyou.....	65,403	7,142	10.9
Solano.....	94,714	8,829	9.3
Sonoma.....	77,774	11,756	15.1
Stanislaus.....	237,579	39,275	26.5
Sutter.....	153,680	17,526	11.4
Tehama.....	84,936	11,832	13.9
Trinity.....	5,857	1,936	33.1
Tulare.....	1,116,849	65,560	5.9
Tuolumne.....	3,861	1,521	39.4
Ventura.....	132,439	9,562	7.2
Yolo.....	117,523	7,949	6.8
Yuba.....	39,781	5,195	13.1
Total or average.....	8,775,339	882,117	10.1

## COLORADO

Adams.....	\$128,822	\$8,740	6.8
Alamosa.....	67,659	4,846	7.2
Arapahoe.....	73,716	6,449	8.7
Archuleta.....	6,565	2,349	35.8
Baca.....	316,893	19,885	6.3
Bent.....	79,646	6,834	8.6
Boulder.....	86,629	6,043	7.0

Gross payments to farmers and County Agricultural Conservation Association expenses, 1940 conservation program—Continued

## COLORADO—continued

County	Gross payments	Association expense	Percent expense is of payments
Chaffee.....	\$5,653	\$792	14.0
Cheyenne.....	104,709	8,640	8.3
Conejos.....	58,203	7,284	12.5
Costilla.....	10,941	3,982	36.4
Crowley.....	27,958	5,075	18.2
Custer.....	11,344	2,883	25.4
Delta.....	32,070	8,711	27.2
Dolores.....	1,987	1,772	89.2
Douglas.....	25,989	2,884	11.1
Eagle.....	16,342	2,602	15.9
Elbert.....	107,819	12,073	11.2
El Paso.....	124,554	10,146	8.1
Fremont.....	16,514	5,688	34.4
Garfield.....	33,174	7,684	23.2
Grand.....	13,759	1,938	14.1
Gunnison.....	5,341	1,197	22.4
Huerfano.....	14,809	5,602	37.8
Jackson.....	20,991	908	4.3
Jefferson.....	24,056	2,921	12.1
Kiowa.....	98,150	8,166	8.3
Kit Carson.....	225,186	16,586	7.4
La Plata.....	39,971	8,810	22.0
Larimer.....	123,662	9,817	7.9
Las Animas.....	102,268	12,452	12.2
Lincoln.....	173,849	11,447	6.6
Logan.....	258,836	14,506	5.6
Mesa.....	18,108	4,883	27.0
Moffat.....	24,403	5,303	21.7
Montezuma.....	15,827	4,968	31.4
Montrose.....	57,158	7,681	13.4
Morgan.....	185,758	14,371	7.7
Otero.....	62,866	6,463	10.3
Ouray.....	9,316	2,145	23.0
Park.....	24,007	3,599	15.0
Phillips.....	196,655	8,038	4.1
Pitkin.....	10,541	2,170	20.6
Prowers.....	179,484	11,992	6.7
Pueblo.....	66,418	10,473	15.8
Rio Blanco.....	66,122	2,978	23.7
Rio Grande.....	159,469	6,221	3.9
Routt.....	20,772	4,201	20.2
Saguache.....	74,023	3,463	4.7
San Miguel.....	4,350	1,531	35.2
Sedgwick.....	123,253	6,496	5.3
Summit.....	3,391	660	19.5
Teller.....	13,131	2,832	21.6
Washington.....	261,120	17,870	6.8
Weld.....	594,003	41,445	7.0
Yuma.....	306,295	15,604	5.1
Total or average.....	4,860,960	415,099	8.5

## CONNECTICUT

Fairfield.....	\$36,707	\$5,066	13.8
Hartford.....	233,088	18,159	7.8
Litchfield.....	57,328	5,419	9.4
Middlesex.....	30,218	4,666	15.4
New Haven.....	51,642	8,221	15.9
New London.....	63,370	6,470	10.2
Tolland.....	45,953	5,430	11.8
Windham.....	32,538	3,516	10.8
Total or average.....	550,844	56,947	10.3

## DELAWARE

Kent.....	\$151,330	\$7,492	5.0
New Castle.....	106,103	4,427	4.2
Sussex.....	230,529	16,629	7.2
Total or average.....	487,962	28,548	5.9

## FLORIDA

Alachua.....	\$48,094	\$13,601	28.0
Baker.....	7,680	2,451	32.0
Bay.....	2,520	635	25.0
Bradford.....	15,837	2,023	12.7
Brevard.....	53,769	2,765	5.1
Broward.....	67,611	4,156	6.1
Calhoun.....	9,107	2,629	28.8
Charlotte.....	37,730	1,288	3.4
Citrus.....	3,988	1,366	34.2
Clay.....	10,290	745	7.0
Collier.....	7,612	219	3.0
Columbia.....	41,852	10,204	24.0
Dade.....	81,343	4,402	5.4
De Soto.....	38,820	5,648	15.2
Dixie.....	3,200	798	25.0
Duval.....	3,524	456	13.0
Escambia.....	24,788	2,440	10.0
Flagler.....	13,795	1,145	8.3
Gadsden.....	33,166	9,904	30.0
Gilchrist.....	21,703	4,806	22.0
Glades.....	27,142	1,254	5.0

Gross payments to farmers and County Agricultural Conservation Association expenses, 1940 conservation program—Continued

## FLORIDA—continued

County	Gross payments	Association expense	Percent expense is of payments
Gulf.....	\$558	\$117	21.0
Hamilton.....	59,193	7,248	12.2
Hardee.....	42,834	7,039	16.4
Hendry.....	5,432	659	12.1
Hernando.....	20,880	1,515	7.4
Hillsborough.....	97,040	4,289	4.4
Holmes.....	58,033	14,096	24.3
Indian River.....	40,742	5,711	14.0
Jackson.....	20,247	1,461	7.3
Jefferson.....	114,535	21,201	18.5
Lafayette.....	39,317	8,619	21.9
Lake.....	27,295	4,077	15.0
Lee.....	78,774	8,268	10.5
Leon.....	16,513	3,403	20.6
Levy.....	27,635	7,334	27.1
Liberty.....	27,577	5,408	19.6
Madison.....	86,564	8,931	10.3
Manatee.....	52,929	4,600	8.7
Marion.....	51,154	10,474	20.1
Martin.....	3,594	593	16.4
Nassau.....	5,499	1,645	30.0
Okaloosa.....	25,010	4,119	16.5
Okeechobee.....	2,739	1,360	50.0
Orange.....	103,886	9,123	9.0
Osceola.....	54,750	1,612	2.9
Palm Beach.....	98,850	5,211	5.3
Pasco.....	64,017	5,786	9.0
Pinellas.....	22,199	3,054	13.7
Polk.....	183,603	14,000	7.7
Putnam.....	26,643	3,727	14.0
St. Johns.....	22,410	1,883	8.4
St. Lucie.....	33,972	2,997	8.8
Santa Rosa.....	30,400	5,281	17.3
Sarasota.....	18,686	1,674	8.9
Seminole.....	48,081	8,149	16.9
Sumter.....	17,282	5,483	31.7
Suwannee.....	108,485	10,500	9.7
Taylor.....	7,894	2,469	31.3
Union.....	21,377	3,696	17.3
Volusia.....	30,062	2,723	9.0
Wakulla.....	1,757	761	43.3
Walton.....	35,493	7,531	21.2
Washington.....	17,640	4,706	26.7
Total or average.....	2,404,811	305,862	12.7

## GEORGIA

Appling	\$84,446	\$8,917	10.5
Atkinson	39,097	2,683	6.9
Bacon	46,902	5,738	12.2
Baker	25,900	4,688	18.1
Baldwin	43,324	6,188	14.3
Banks	55,628	5,712	10.3
Barrow	96,419	4,706	4.9
Bartow	151,149	11,723	7.7
Ben Hill	44,338	5,163	11.6
Berrien	98,832	8,781	8.9
Bibb	27,750	6,379	23.0
Bleckley	64,640	4,285	6.6
Brantley	18,045	3,427	19.0
Brooks	97,266	15,817	16.3
Bryan	7,912	1,797	22.7
Bulloch	218,922	12,826	5.8
Burke	350,440	10,254	2.9
Butts	59,307	4,033	6.8
Calhoun	57,674	6,414	11.1
Camden	397	137	34.5
Candler	86,274	8,051	9.3
Carroll	255,624	15,026	5.9
Catoosa	39,439	5,248	13.3
Charlton	5,216	1,837	35.2
Chatam	7,677	1,784	23.2
Chattahoochee	9,372	1,851	19.7
Chattooga	83,297	7,932	9.5
Cherokee	81,662	4,396	5.4
Clarke	37,778	3,602	9.5
Clay	42,660	5,093	11.9
Clayton	31,243	3,491	11.2
Clinch	8,784	1,475	16.8
Cobb	106,655	9,728	9.1
Coffee	133,675	9,921	7.4
Colquitt	182,516	23,673	13.0
Columbia	69,688	4,320	6.2
Cook	64,202	6,555	10.2
Coweta	130,838	5,884	4.5
Crawford	43,150	4,171	9.7
Crisp	92,969	9,514	10.2
Dade	15,705	3,196	20.3
Dawson	16,546	2,512	15.2
Decatur	27,817	10,618	38.2
De Kalb	40,795	7,173	17.6
Dodge	141,979	11,179	7.9
Dooly	147,006	12,415	8.4
Dougherty	39,368	7,210	18.3
Douglas	52,549	2,860	5.4
Early	110,529	12,532	11.3
Echols	8,561	2,835	33.1
Effingham	32,592	5,865	17.9
Elbert	106,220	9,476	8.9

Gross payments to farmers and County Agricultural Conservation Association expenses, 1940 conservation program—Continued

GEORGIA—continued

County	Gross payments	Association expense	Percent expense is of payments
Emanuel	\$245,470	\$11,460	4.7
Evans	48,287	5,288	10.9
Fannin	23,867	2,546	10.7
Fayette	71,889	3,256	4.5
Floyd	149,012	10,325	6.9
Forsyth	92,131	3,888	4.2
Franklin	128,155	5,921	4.6
Fulton	96,222	5,769	6.0
Gilmer	13,891	3,915	28.2
Glenn	52,059	5,567	10.7
Glynn	506		
Gordon	137,201	8,948	6.5
Grady	40,048	10,535	26.0
Greene	59,293	4,659	7.8
Gwinnett	159,621	8,366	5.2
Habersham	30,690	3,674	12.0
Hall	106,476	7,862	7.4
Hancock	84,486	8,126	9.6
Harrison	87,148	8,359	9.6
Harris	51,298	4,467	8.7
Hart	159,826	8,708	5.4
Heard	66,314	3,530	5.3
Henry	147,112	6,533	4.4
Houston	64,162	10,437	16.3
Irwin	77,986	11,440	14.7
Jackson	122,845	9,505	7.7
Jasper	54,476	4,163	7.6
Jeff Davis	51,729	7,656	14.8
Jefferson	202,064	13,436	6.6
Jenkins	134,134	11,527	8.6
Johnson	125,493	9,828	7.8
Jones	31,562	5,113	16.2
Lamar	55,274	3,435	6.2
Lanier	28,289	5,489	19.4
Laurens	263,683	18,920	7.2
Lee	44,436	6,488	14.6
Liberty	12,328	2,773	22.5
Lincoln	55,434	5,195	9.4
Long	13,833	2,158	15.6
Lowndes	91,727	14,647	16.0
Lumpkin	17,788	2,637	14.8
McDuffie	85,778	5,704	6.6
McIntosh	80		
Macon	141,941	12,518	8.8
Madison	120,136	8,357	7.0
Marion	28,099	3,408	12.1
Meriwether	125,448	9,952	7.9
Miller	36,036	6,663	18.4
Mitchell	133,816	25,151	18.8
Monroe	40,675	4,664	11.5
Montgomery	69,789	6,437	9.2
Morgan	119,523	6,410	5.4
Murray	65,283	6,063	9.3
Muscogee	17,592	2,499	14.2
Newton	96,574	7,527	7.7
Oconee	70,380	4,903	7.0
Oglethorpe	108,020	6,380	5.9
Paulding	86,897	7,674	8.8
Peach	65,393	6,540	10.0
Pickens	33,646	4,467	13.3
Pierce	68,980	5,157	7.5
Pike	90,078	6,803	7.5
Polk	108,273	6,484	6.0
Pulaski	59,701	8,782	14.7
Putnam	37,297	5,648	15.1
Quitman	19,148	2,794	14.6
Rabun	10,667	1,820	17.0
Randolph	89,635	9,600	10.7
Richmond	57,979	6,085	10.5
Rockdale	49,735	3,768	7.6
Schley	37,788	3,916	10.4
Screven	188,313	9,186	4.9
Seminole	27,556	5,376	19.5
Spalding	61,591	4,951	8.0
Stephens	36,036	1,978	5.5
Stewart	42,657	5,336	12.5
Sumter	130,039	10,135	7.8
Talbot	33,865	4,174	12.3
Talferro	38,317	4,269	11.1
Tattnall	90,578	10,557	11.6
Taylor	83,098	4,302	5.2
Telfair	93,684	6,695	7.5
Terrell	109,719	8,174	7.4
Thomas	82,181	15,703	19.1
Tift	86,774	7,893	9.1
Toombs	103,090	9,737	9.4
Towns	9,100	2,549	28.0
Trenton	66,327	4,966	7.5
Troup	69,376	6,704	9.7
Turner	33,148	9,174	27.7
Twiggs	28,719	6,252	21.8
Union	22,398	3,145	14.0
Upson	48,651	4,397	9.0
Walker	89,727	7,349	8.2
Walton	182,557	6,859	3.7
Ware	37,010	7,377	20.0
Warren	118,886	8,305	7.0
Washington	175,665	11,416	6.5
Wayne	60,778	6,895	11.3
Webster	26,571	5,419	20.4
Wheeler	83,573	4,360	5.2
White	27,817	4,202	15.1
Whitfield	73,380	8,682	11.8

Gross payments to farmers and County Agricultural Conservation Association expenses, 1940 conservation program—Continued

GEORGIA—continued

County	Gross payments	Association expense	Percent expense is of payments
Wilcox	\$94,082	\$10,258	10.9
Wilkes	103,522	9,265	8.9
Wilkinson	45,473	4,490	9.9
Worth	113,885	19,843	17.4
Total or average	12,138,968	1,064,467	9.0

IDAHO

County	Gross payments	Association expense	Percent expense is of payments
Ada	\$67,949	\$8,177	12.0
Adams	12,879	3,455	26.8
Bannock	81,851	17,565	21.5
Bear Lake	46,441	7,427	16.0
Benewah	45,369	5,730	12.6
Bingham	146,759	11,805	8.0
Blaine	16,415	3,815	23.2
Boise	6,889	2,253	32.7
Bonner	12,584	7,847	62.4
Bonneville	150,478	7,993	5.3
Boundary	56,135	4,787	8.5
Butte	16,010	3,521	22.0
Camas	24,875	3,028	12.2
Canyon	119,452	13,422	11.2
Caribou	36,190	4,182	11.6
Cassia	93,623	9,412	10.0
Clark	8,176	2,413	29.5
Clearwater	25,245	6,784	26.9
Custer	11,514	2,966	25.8
Elmore	26,377	6,531	24.8
Franklin	67,947	7,555	11.1
Fremont	113,877	9,794	8.6
Gem	26,276	5,711	21.7
Gooding	55,246	6,441	11.7
Idaho	137,588	8,107	5.9
Jefferson	101,287	8,156	8.1
Jerome	69,051	6,454	9.3
Kootenai	34,455	8,372	20.5
Latah	165,475	9,233	5.6
Lemhi	18,457	5,507	29.8
Lewis	123,743	3,380	2.7
Lincoln	32,831	4,553	13.9
Madison	109,057	6,368	5.9
Minidoka	45,499	6,462	14.2
Nez Perce	147,694	10,485	7.1
Oneida	92,393	6,542	7.1
Owyhee	51,769	8,432	16.3
Payette	22,768	5,612	24.6
Power	107,551	6,301	5.9
Teton	59,294	5,868	9.9
Twin Falls	163,427	16,805	10.3
Valley	21,252	3,640	17.1
Washington	48,186	9,033	18.7
Total or average	2,821,044	301,964	10.7

ILLINOIS

County	Gross payments	Association expense	Percent expense is of payments
Adams	\$293,541	\$20,209	7.1
Bond	95,509	11,652	12.2
Boone	148,359	9,859	6.6
Brown	122,816	10,077	8.2
Bureau	455,616	13,244	2.9
Calhoun	81,345	8,562	10.5
Carroll	265,741	9,391	3.5
Cass	219,253	5,922	2.7
Champaign	694,561	14,560	2.1
Christian	295,586	14,666	5.0
Clark	176,044	11,293	6.4
Clay	131,916	11,014	8.3
Clinton	160,679	10,892	6.8
Coles	247,449	7,478	3.0
Cook	83,994	9,444	11.2
Crawford	124,210	11,761	9.5
Cumberland	118,332	15,512	13.1
De Kalb	386,174	14,841	3.8
De Witt	237,427	3,837	1.6
Douglas	220,665	10,163	4.6
Du Page	58,258	6,704	11.5
Edgar	354,782	14,194	4.0
Edwards	107,660	4,320	4.0
Effingham	131,171	17,695	13.5
Fayette	136,206	15,070	11.1
Ford	394,466	14,185	3.6
Franklin	66,376	12,305	18.0
Fulton	429,479	23,284	5.4
Gallatin	126,632	6,938	5.5
Greene	232,762	9,120	3.9
Grundy	219,088	3,778	1.7
Hamilton	98,736	8,749	8.9
Hancock	355,280	20,890	5.9
Henderson	235,368	13,802	5.9
Henry	502,404	16,567	3.3
Irroquois	721,657	14,896	2.1
Jackson	148,047	10,113	6.8
Jasper	139,357	11,524	8.3
Jefferson	141,807	18,912	13.3
Jersey	129,524	9,039	7.0
Jo Daviess	186,337	14,344	7.7
Johnson	90,294	8,099	9.6

Gross payments to farmers and County Agricultural Conservation Association expenses, 1940 conservation program—Continued

ILLINOIS—continued

County	Gross payments	Association expense	Percent expense is of payments
Kane	\$233,436	\$11,226	4.8
Kankakee	261,917	9,722	3.7
Kendall	146,135	5,338	3.7
Knox	377,979	24,690	6.5
Lake	109,228	8,759	8.0
La Salle	614,970	12,201	2.0
Lawrence	121,657	12,288	10.1
Lee	444,330	16,596	3.7
Livingston	720,299	2,936	
Logan	497,820	14,374	2.9
McDonough	315,766	22,270	7.0
McHenry	315,476	12,815	4.1
McLean	880,976	8,355	1.0
Macon	442,763	9,499	2.1
Macoupin	290,701	21,465	7.4
Madison	128,773	19,074	14.8
Marion	130,832	10,993	8.4
Marshall and Putnam	309,533	9,531	3.1
Mason	347,004	13,089	3.7
Massac	66,785	7,500	11.2
Menard	211,963	10,271	4.8
Mercer	340,907	11,562	3.4
Monroe	115,916	14,977	12.9
Montgomery	216,108	12,536	5.8
Morgan	336,486	16,146	4.8
Moultrie	217,174	6,524	3.0
Ogle	406,887	17,697	4.3
Peoria	286,099	10,670	3.6
Perry	81,601	11,767	14.4
Platt	346,140	1,611	0.0
Pike	249,274	18,847	7.6
Pope and Hardin	102,989	11,547	11.2
Pulaski and Alexander	137,742	13,551	9.8
Randolph	175,097	15,697	9.0
Richland	110,318	10,064	9.1
Rock Island	184,930	11,699	6.3
St. Clair	195,355	21,796	11.2
Saline	119,722	11,105	9.3
Sangamon	550,120	22,391	4.1
Schuyler	205,278	14,218	6.9
Scott	143,811	4,705	3.3
Shelby	261,980	22,332	8.5
Stark	166,338	7,466	4.5
Stephenson	282,458	15,637	5.5
Tazewell	455,292	12,693	2.8
Union	106,940	9,926	9.3
Vermilion	611,304	23,373	3.8
Wabash	107,647	6,235	5.8
Warren	362,887	13,067	3.6
Washington	173,286	13,597	7.8
Wayne	140,875	16,064	11.4
White	179,589	10,011	5.6
Whiteside	395,035	22,021	5.6
Will	163,116	8,136	5.0
Williamson	63,870	17,434	27.3
Winnebago	249,023	11,376	4.6
Woodford	327,164	7,758	2.4
Total or average	25,114,779	1,230,389	4.9

INDIANA

Adams	\$116,693	\$8,313	7.1
Allen	183,066	14,365	7.8
Barthelme	212,690	7,635	3.6
Benton	242,550	7,570	3.1
Blackford	67,211	5,631	8.4
Boone	254,436	17,574	6.9
Brown	25,750	9,099	35.3
Carroll	227,432	10,569	4.7
Cass	230,105	11,870	5.2
Clark	72,255	13,133	18.2
Clay	71,875	12,360	17.2
Clinton	240,482	13,215	5.5
Crawford	49,300	8,421	17.1
Daviess	125,242	11,658	9.3
Dearborn	73,226	11,266	15.5
Decatur	217,273	10,864	5.0
De Kalb	104,835	11,631	11.1
Delaware	182,566	10,273	5.6
Dubois	127,876	10,592	8.3
Elkhart	122,024	13,845	11.3
Fayette	102,779	8,306	8.1
Floyd	32,074	7,338	22.9
Fountain	207,231	10,594	5.1
Franklin	124,722	9,127	7.3
Fulton	213,312	10,960	5.1
Gibson	158,131	13,181	8.3
Grant	200,560	12,365	6.2
Greene	151,741	13,859	9.1
Hamilton	232,774	12,920	5.6
Hancock	162,425	6,894	4.3
Harrison	76,743	12,586	16.4
Hendricks	204,525	14,210	6.9
Henry	151,639	10,672	7.0
Howard	155,475	10,472	6.7
Huntington	159,866	8,863	5.5
Jackson	154,845	9,820	6.3
Jasper	178,882	10,729	6.0
Jay	162,509	8,598	5.3



Gross payments to farmers and County Agricultural Conservation Association expenses, 1940 conservation program—Continued

## INDIANA—continued

County	Gross payments	Association expense	Percent expense is of payments
Jefferson	\$92,941	\$14,793	15.9
Jennings	88,362	10,801	12.2
Johnson	218,340	6,240	2.9
Knox	210,629	14,776	7.0
Kosciusko	113,599	13,874	6.5
Lacrange	133,419	8,951	5.8
Lake	122,062	7,359	6.0
La Porte	243,520	14,426	5.9
Lawrence	110,480	9,822	8.9
Madison	256,734	10,982	4.3
Marion	108,962	11,009	10.1
Marshall	221,062	13,556	6.1
Martin	78,256	7,407	9.5
Miami	205,715	11,408	5.5
Monroe	88,875	9,982	11.2
Montgomery	293,974	13,433	4.6
Morgan	196,070	9,144	4.6
Newton	196,912	6,975	3.5
Noble	135,091	11,704	8.7
Ohio	21,690	6,233	2.9
Orange	106,131	8,879	8.4
Owen	78,344	8,364	10.7
Parke	163,131	11,489	7.0
Perry	59,020	9,963	16.9
Pike	79,799	9,109	11.4
Porter	116,479	8,771	7.5
Posey	135,817	10,608	7.8
Pulaski	145,311	10,881	7.5
Putnam	185,054	13,724	7.4
Randolph	229,206	13,645	6.0
Ripley	113,847	9,639	8.5
Rush	248,268	9,561	3.9
St. Joseph	138,382	8,569	6.2
Scott	51,726	3,172	6.1
Shelby	219,810	10,637	4.8
Spencer	117,723	11,334	9.6
Starke	94,089	10,703	11.4
Steuben	97,483	12,621	12.9
Sullivan	175,446	9,251	5.3
Switzerland	51,879	8,644	16.7
Tippecanoe	239,474	12,167	5.1
Tipton	142,675	7,883	5.5
Union	68,867	4,249	6.2
Vanderburgh	68,907	4,942	7.2
Vermillion	68,342	6,842	10.0
Vigo	111,748	10,562	9.5
Wabash	184,307	11,031	6.0
Warren	216,015	6,897	3.2
Warrick	90,733	8,394	9.3
Washington	159,801	9,263	6.6
Wayne	187,024	12,356	6.6
Wells	151,331	10,593	7.0
White	226,189	11,627	5.1
Whitley	112,834	8,004	7.1
Total or average	13,608,845	946,217	7.0

## IOWA

Adair	\$386,637	\$19,251	5.0
Adams	268,530	14,488	5.4
Allamakee	211,040	13,311	6.3
Appanoose	204,342	12,557	6.1
Audubon	327,809	15,723	4.8
Benton	529,445	20,523	3.9
Black Hawk	373,762	20,903	5.6
Boone	466,450	20,498	4.4
Bremer	177,237	13,794	7.8
Buchanan	349,359	15,222	4.4
Buena Vista	492,134	24,430	5.0
Butler	303,918	19,660	6.5
Calhoun	329,993	43,831	8.3
Carroll	417,099	16,639	4.0
Cass	374,532	14,376	3.8
Cedar	345,499	11,534	3.3
Cerro Gordo	320,642	24,102	7.5
Cherokee	329,031	25,074	7.6
Chickasaw	222,187	11,071	5.0
Clarke	216,128	11,368	5.3
Clay	443,672	12,059	2.7
Clayton	390,058	12,742	3.3
Clinton	458,196	16,453	3.6
Crawford	363,602	20,875	5.7
Dallas	406,896	14,906	3.2
Davis	171,118	12,564	7.3
Decatur	226,868	12,599	5.6
Delaware	359,703	15,922	4.4
Des Moines	220,269	10,064	4.6
Dickinson	288,770	9,819	3.4
Dubuque	316,506	14,476	4.6
Emmet	209,711	19,560	6.5
Fayette	369,634	18,433	5.0
Floyd	236,287	6,822	2.9
Franklin	443,917	26,731	6.0
Fremont	399,257	12,654	3.2
Greene	454,686	17,243	3.8
Grundy	316,738	22,690	7.2
Guthrie	381,881	26,626	7.0
Hamilton	488,345	17,527	3.6
Hancock	403,211	22,056	5.5
Hardin	471,308	12,105	2.6

Gross payments to farmers and County Agricultural Conservation Association expenses, 1940 conservation program—Continued

## IOWA—continued

County	Gross payments	Association expense	Percent expense is of payments
Harrison	\$422,741	\$26,618	6.3
Henry	254,282	8,325	3.3
Howard	202,459	10,390	5.1
Humboldt	376,034	21,823	5.8
Ida	271,905	17,500	6.4
Iowa	399,461	11,419	2.9
Jackson	311,430	18,535	6.0
Jasper	607,033	22,201	3.7
Jefferson	212,720	13,908	6.5
Johnson	361,544	9,288	2.6
Jones	357,343	14,593	4.1
Keokuk	373,246	16,436	4.4
Kossuth	773,381	32,576	4.2
Lee	163,640	11,159	6.8
Linn	394,050	15,314	3.9
Louisia	233,706	11,383	4.9
Lucas	185,145	8,455	4.6
Lyon	331,803	16,633	5.0
Madison	346,657	24,971	7.2
Mahaska	412,494	16,061	3.9
Marion	373,002	18,511	5.0
Marshall	442,170	18,530	4.2
Mills	368,892	24,020	7.1
Mitchell	255,417	9,663	3.8
Monona	468,285	31,662	6.8
Monroe	173,393	7,954	5.9
Montgomery	324,150	11,228	3.5
Muscatine	237,595	19,296	8.1
O'Brien	429,115	8,173	1.9
Osceola	319,009	13,841	4.3
Page	333,143	23,425	7.0
Palo Alto	440,555	10,687	2.4
Plymouth	355,495	19,911	5.6
Pocahontas	552,053	39,722	7.2
Polk	430,822	23,765	5.5
Pottawattamie (E)	318,185	18,255	5.7
Pottawattamie (W)	387,938	11,558	3.0
Poweshiek	462,610	22,853	4.9
Ringgold	277,042	10,994	4.0
Sac	443,170	22,361	5.0
Scott	243,583	10,459	4.3
Shelby	457,681	20,060	4.4
Sioux	346,199	16,707	4.8
Story	567,592	3,845	.7
Tama	492,316	13,869	2.8
Taylor	291,570	19,688	6.8
Union	226,377	17,829	7.9
Van Buren	160,798	11,984	7.5
Wapello	200,054	12,732	6.4
Warren	329,177	15,842	4.8
Washington	331,571	12,985	3.9
Wayne	247,593	16,362	6.6
Webster	570,124	24,801	4.4
Winnebago	280,911	1,816	0.6
Winnesiek	383,697	17,386	4.5
Woodbury	526,118	22,091	4.2
Worth	209,419	11,053	5.3
Wright	494,861	24,562	5.0
Total or average	35,530,263	1,691,349	4.8

## KANSAS

Allen	\$107,832	\$7,994	7.4
Anderson	124,793	6,766	5.4
Atchison	152,703	9,278	6.1
Barber	184,756	9,963	5.4
Barton	330,748	2,877	.9
Bourbon	119,156	11,805	9.9
Brown	291,984	10,606	3.6
Butler	140,980	13,292	9.4
Chase	64,957	5,228	8.0
Chautauqua	61,942	8,904	14.4
Cherokee	57,474	6,719	11.7
Cheyenne	216,372	8,010	3.7
Clark	193,154	10,964	5.7
Clay	111,791	6,778	6.1
Cloud	139,318	10,166	7.3
Coffey	145,620	8,055	5.5
Comanche	185,298	7,396	4.0
Cowley	98,415	12,914	13.1
Crawford	110,716	9,055	8.2
Decatur	231,242	8,580	3.7
Dickinson	181,856	6,606	3.6
Doniphan	192,585	12,135	6.3
Douglas	83,489	8,916	10.7
Edwards	249,499	8,659	3.5
Elk	75,202	7,771	10.3
Ellis	276,569	10,042	3.6
Ellsworth	182,363	8,086	4.4
Finney	330,292	11,093	3.4
Ford	431,628	14,826	3.4
Franklin	140,075	7,814	5.6
Geary	61,624	3,353	5.4
Gove	223,550	10,829	4.8
Graham	228,664	10,808	4.7
Grant	198,851	5,559	2.8
Gray	336,572	9,356	2.8
Greely	174,339	8,864	5.1
Greenwood	125,948	11,166	8.9

Gross payments to farmers and County Agricultural Conservation Association expenses, 1940 conservation program—Continued

## KANSAS—continued

County	Gross payments	Association expense	Percent expense is of payments
Hamilton	\$193,537	\$6,351	3.3
Harper	151,583	5,864	3.9
Harvey	82,389	5,592	6.8
Haskell	240,087	4,386	1.8
Hodgeman	229,718	6,861	3.0
Jackson	176,749	10,749	6.1
Jefferson	173,667	13,944	8.0
Jewell	202,675	10,059	5.0
Johnson	88,336	18,684	12.1
Kearny	164,875	9,253	5.6
Kingman	182,024	7,852	4.3
Kiowa	239,495	7,382	3.1
Labette	113,345	8,459	7.5
Lane	216,981	7,881	3.6
Leavenworth	83,690	6,969	8.3
Lincoln	187,433	8,263	4.4
Linn	138,393	7,565	5.7
Logan	127,002	7,252	5.7
Lyon	156,335	12,467	8.0
McPherson	171,434	6,536	3.8
Marion	110,064	6,566	6.0
Marshall	242,597	16,363	6.7
Meade	284,278	5,561	2.0
Miami	171,676	6,444	3.8
Mitchell	221,899	9,286	4.2
Montgomery	77,643	9,961	12.8
Morris	115,168	8,529	7.4
Morton	165,753	6,633	4.0
Nemaha	290,166	12,716	4.3
Neosho	110,863	10,451	9.4
Ness	338,465	8,422	2.5
Norton	303,003	12,008	4.0
Osage	158,673	11,460	7.2
Osborne	212,749	12,277	5.8
Ottawa	125,604	11,139	8.9
Pawnee	315,287	3,808	1.2
Phillips	291,442	14,212	4.9
Pottawatomie	150,845	6,904	4.6
Pratt	279,824	9,704	3.5
Rawlins	258,116	9,378	3.6
Reno	275,527	12,562	4.6
Republic	132,899	8,858	6.7
Rice	182,510	10,022	5.5
Riley	62,938	7,255	11.5
Rooks	211,743	11,607	5.5
Rush	290,790	7,577	2.6
Russell	256,627	9,859	3.8
Saline	158,665	7,243	4.6
Scott	201,221	6,732	3.3
Sedgwick	204,784	3,186	1.6
Seward	191,191	6,251	3.3
Shawnee	96,103	9,913	10.3
Sheridan	229,471	6,368	2.8
Sherman	230,255	7,652	3.3
Smith	263,064	14,224	5.4
Stafford	291,224	5,621	1.9
Stanton	224,243	3,656	2.5
Stevens	213,658	9,452	4.4
Sumner	164,186	9,838	6.0
Thomas	347,391	9,774	2.8
Trego	234,911	8,987	3.8
Wabaunsee	131,509	10,172	7.7
Wallace	101,198	6,003	5.9
Washington	202,773	14,798	7.3
Wichita	155,432	6,150	4.0
Wilson	74,339	10,053	13.5
Woodson	58,244	4,401	7.6
Wyandotte	13,870	4,909	35.4
Total or average	19,313,856	922,544	4.8

## KENTUCKY

Adair	\$72,391	\$11,849	16.4
Allen	75,332	11,879	15.8
Anderson	53,436	7,120	13.3
Ballard	108,807	9,143	8.4
Barren	184,569	18,320	9.9
Bath	85,501	6,825	8.0
Bell	15,412	4,519	29.3
Boone	65,307	9,690	14.8
Bourbon	150,638	12,533	8.3
Boyd	27,714	4,765	17.2
Boyle	71,451	7,492	10.5
Broken	75,066	6,596	8.8
Breathitt	46,344	7,818	17.8
Breckenridge	135,870	11,733	8.6
Bullitt	47,539	4,682	9.8
Butler	78,931	10,939	13.8
Caldwell	94,114	7,669	8.2
Calloway	247,294	15,596	10.6
Campbell	29,954	7,754	25.9
Carlisle	69,055	8,225	12.6
Carroll	50,578	5,484	10.8
Carter	74,614	13,723	18.4
Casey	88,758	21,586	24.3
Christian	212,764	17,520	8.2
Clark	101,381	8,741	8.6
Clay	112,244	13,293	11.8
Clinton	48,530	7,908	10.3

Gross payments to farmers and County Agricultural Conservation Association expenses, 1940 conservation program—Continued

KENTUCKY—continued

County	Gross payments	Association expense	Percent expense is of payments
Crittenden	\$74,809	\$11,778	15.7
Cumberland	40,945	10,449	25.5
Daviess	207,521	16,866	8.1
Edmonson	50,769	7,965	15.7
Elliott	52,703	6,797	12.9
Estill	21,611	5,161	23.9
Fayette	146,150	7,975	5.4
Fleming	108,983	11,265	10.3
Floyd	30,404	5,997	19.7
Franklin	78,550	8,884	11.3
Fulton	151,652	9,181	6.0
Gallatin	27,108	6,025	22.2
Garrard	99,017	6,638	6.7
Grant	90,890	11,877	13.1
Graves	208,733	24,483	11.7
Grayson	109,230	12,620	11.5
Green	105,210	14,556	13.8
Greenup	46,354	10,239	22.1
Hancock	53,078	8,288	15.6
Hardin	140,266	16,276	11.6
Harlan	8,943	2,387	26.7
Harrison	123,316	10,972	8.9
Hart	121,921	14,058	11.5
Henderson	240,487	16,904	7.0
Henry	109,634	16,066	14.6
Hickman	116,683	9,962	8.5
Hopkins	99,155	12,100	12.2
Jackson	52,352	7,382	14.1
Jefferson	85,660	8,695	10.1
Jessamine	76,099	8,346	11.0
Johnson	54,528	6,725	12.3
Kenton	33,821	7,144	21.1
Knott	26,129	4,502	17.2
Knox	62,173	8,711	14.0
Larue	82,766	10,108	12.2
Laurel	66,781	11,309	16.9
Lawrence	47,582	5,759	12.1
Lee	18,526	4,480	24.2
Leslie	14,977	4,988	33.0
Letcher	19,327	3,364	17.4
Lewis	53,156	10,732	20.2
Lincoln	91,969	9,472	10.6
Livingston	86,722	11,667	13.4
Logan	214,777	16,642	7.7
Lyon	47,222	5,533	11.7
McCracken	47,815	9,026	18.9
McCreary	13,095	2,886	22.0
McLean	102,690	8,686	8.4
Madison	162,952	7,870	4.8
Magoffin	57,771	10,523	18.2
Marion	84,919	8,755	10.3
Marshall	76,506	11,619	15.2
Martin	8,499	2,640	31.1
Mason	114,363	8,570	7.5
Meade	61,491	7,557	12.3
Menifee	25,127	5,372	21.4
Mercer	109,140	10,002	9.2
Metcalfe	80,369	12,630	15.7
Monroe	70,506	10,596	15.0
Montgomery	91,733	7,589	8.3
Morgan	112,011	15,385	13.7
Muhlenberg	69,907	12,909	18.5
Nelson	102,578	11,708	11.4
Nicholas	75,658	8,883	11.7
Ohio	114,845	15,724	13.7
Oldham	55,543	5,091	9.2
Owen	109,828	12,078	11.0
Owsley	45,002	8,471	18.6
Pendleton	77,370	8,339	10.8
Perry	33,206	5,556	16.7
Pike	30,814	8,186	26.6
Powell	22,251	3,299	14.8
Pulaski	126,802	14,550	11.5
Robertson	37,505	5,022	13.4
Rockcastle	74,791	6,861	9.2
Rowan	29,507	5,729	19.4
Russell	60,698	12,254	20.2
Scott	105,777	8,878	8.4
Shelby	155,203	13,716	8.8
Simpson	110,997	10,833	9.7
Spencer	65,011	4,579	7.3
Taylor	88,556	16,163	18.2
Todd	126,298	9,309	7.4
Trigg	110,538	7,887	7.1
Trimble	54,928	6,821	12.4
Union	147,345	10,653	7.2
Warren	149,720	16,343	10.9
Washington	101,951	11,346	11.1
Wayne	69,177	10,747	15.5
Webster	116,694	11,402	9.8
Whitley	49,914	7,809	15.6
Wolfe	51,879	9,845	19.0
Woodford	119,386	8,663	7.2
Total or average	10,029,669	1,164,650	11.6

LOUISIANA

Acadia	\$291,068	\$18,709	6.2
Allen	42,283	6,067	14.3
Ascension	42,937	3,977	9.3

Gross payments to farmers and County Agricultural Conservation Association expenses, 1940 conservation program—Continued

LOUISIANA—continued

County	Gross payments	Association expense	Percent expense is of payments
Assumption	\$28,173	\$1,107	3.9
Avoyelles	284,461	20,366	7.2
Beauregard	29,995	7,556	25.2
Bienville	186,443	16,036	8.6
Bossier	251,716	15,349	6.1
Caddo	400,178	13,950	3.5
Calcasieu	56,542	7,415	13.1
Caldwell	59,811	7,903	13.2
Cameron	34,622	5,312	15.3
Catahoula	123,828	6,700	5.4
Claiborne	218,230	15,504	7.1
Concordia	124,883	6,646	5.3
De Soto	210,877	19,401	9.2
East Baton Rouge	54,125	8,613	15.9
East Carroll	258,254	10,819	4.2
East Feliciana	84,174	8,170	9.7
Evangeline	231,562	16,582	7.2
Franklin	384,068	24,680	6.4
Grant	55,850	7,281	13.0
Iberia	48,780	2,647	5.4
Iberville	25,211	1,932	7.7
Jackson	59,346	8,757	14.7
Jefferson	3,914		
Jefferson Davis	123,496	13,533	10.9
Lafayette	224,469	10,335	4.6
La Fourche	47,609	1,452	3.0
La Salle	18,253	3,572	19.5
Lincoln	163,512	13,186	8.1
Livingston	30,879	6,438	20.8
Madison	202,936	11,177	5.5
Morehouse	249,237	15,212	6.1
Natchitoches	299,511	16,329	5.4
Orleans	915		
Ouachita	142,893	12,159	8.5
Plaquemines	7,309	1,236	16.9
Pointe Coupee	156,731	7,188	4.6
Rapides	229,032	12,951	5.6
Red River	178,583	12,989	7.3
Richland	331,310	25,503	7.7
Sabine	100,642	13,324	13.2
St. Bernard	2,904		
St. Charles	7,703	1,914	24.8
St. Helena	47,811	8,583	17.9
St. James	28,783	1,230	4.3
St. John the Baptist	14,086	222	1.6
St. Landry	437,286	26,317	6.0
St. Martin	114,941	6,029	5.3
St. Mary	25,688	704	2.7
St. Tammany	30,468	3,891	12.8
Tangipahoa	75,480	12,549	16.6
Tensas	225,528	10,120	4.5
Terrebonne	22,428	843	3.8
Union	175,017	16,090	9.2
Vermilion	199,733	15,558	7.8
Vernon	51,168	9,880	19.3
Washington	145,715	15,242	10.5
Webster	152,304	13,753	9.0
West Baton Rouge	17,253	1,544	8.9
West Carroll	223,566	11,593	5.2
West Feliciana	35,293	6,088	17.2
Winn	50,517	6,696	13.2
Total or average	8,180,400	608,909	7.4

MAINE

Androscoggin	\$37,779	\$5,088	13.5
Aroostook	1,098,820	51,117	4.6
Cumberland	42,979	7,196	16.7
Franklin	28,486	4,055	14.2
Hancock	20,576	3,058	14.9
Kennebec	55,341	6,103	11.0
Knox	12,675	1,864	14.7
Lincoln	18,312	2,189	11.9
Oxford	43,226	7,172	16.6
Penobscot	108,022	9,146	8.5
Piscataquis	40,075	3,374	8.4
Sagadahoc	11,767	2,362	20.1
Somerset	61,544	5,507	8.9
Waldo	39,489	4,887	12.4
Washington	31,120	4,386	14.1
York	44,391	7,569	17.0
Total or average	1,695,002	125,073	7.4

MARYLAND

Allegany	\$19,007	\$3,403	17.9
Anne Arundel	44,586	4,361	9.8
Baltimore	76,780	7,652	10.0
Calvert	31,334	2,036	6.5
Caroline	78,130	6,280	8.0
Carroll	83,801	8,051	9.6
Cecil	57,427	3,062	5.3
Charles	29,986	3,369	11.2
Dorchester	73,843	4,950	6.7
Frederick	140,145	8,865	6.3
Garrett	41,716	5,147	12.3
Harford	52,578	5,163	9.8

Gross payments to farmers and County Agricultural Conservation Association expenses, 1940 conservation program—Continued

MARYLAND—continued

County	Gross payments	Association expense	Percent expense is of payments
Howard	\$50,059	\$3,251	6.5
Kent	91,918	4,080	4.4
Montgomery	86,663	5,794	6.7
Prince Georges	51,267	4,738	9.2
Queen Annes	113,917	4,738	4.2
St. Marys	32,587	4,888	15.0
Somerset	45,764	2,990	6.5
Talbot	80,916	5,435	6.7
Washington	88,795	3,997	4.5
Wicomico	73,030	7,515	10.3
Worcester	66,301	4,021	6.1
Total or average	1,510,550	115,021	7.6

MASSACHUSETTS

Barnstable	\$11,568	\$1,721	14.9
Berkshire	35,232	4,045	11.5
Bristol	45,521	7,788	17.1
Dukes	1,035		
Essex	44,185	7,438	16.8
Franklin	80,722	9,405	11.7
Hampden	48,045	6,957	14.5
Hampshire	109,377	10,780	9.9
Middlesex	68,867	10,413	15.1
Nantucket	210		
Norfolk	26,135	3,616	13.8
Plymouth	39,370	6,947	17.6
Worcester	62,867	6,592	11.1
Total or average	573,134	76,102	13.3

MICHIGAN

Alcona	\$24,981	\$4,093	16.4
Alger	6,549	2,237	34.2
Allegan	168,712	24,307	14.4
Alpena	36,155	6,133	17.0
Antrim	40,824	4,411	10.8
Arenac	41,678	5,456	13.1
Baraga	7,861	2,715	34.5
Barry	132,225	15,108	11.4
Bay	69,584	9,989	14.4
Benzie	34,684	4,783	13.8
Berrien	185,069	24,753	13.4
Branch	166,133	15,288	9.2
Calhoun	172,334	20,899	12.1
Cass	165,650	17,870	10.8
Charlevoix	28,162	4,438	15.8
Cheboygan	26,829	4,704	17.5
Chippewa	71,882	9,024	12.6
Clare	32,196	4,872	15.1
Clinton	163,082	13,195	8.1
Crawford	29,802	3,122	10.5
Delta	33,323	5,664	17.0
Dickinson	17,430	4,631	26.6
Eaton	173,104	13,442	7.8
Emmet	29,008	4,783	16.5
Genesee	142,066	16,483	11.6
Gladwin	56,415	6,701	11.9
Gogebic	7,169	3,264	45.3
Grand Traverse	68,694	6,988	11.6
Gratiot	109,359	10,154	9.3
Hillsdale	158,244	17,468	11.1
Houghton	29,184	6,293	21.6
Huron	137,587	15,314	11.1
Ingham	123,175	15,241	12.4
Ionia	179,748	12,234	6.8
Iosco	20,389	4,271	20.9
Iron	8,702	3,867	44.4
Isabella	95,083	11,402	12.0
Jackson	172,548	16,830	9.8
Kalamazoo	142,211	12,809	9.0
Kalkaska	25,325	3,173	12.5
Kent	191,588	19,620	10.2
Lake	19,500	2,716	13.9
Lapeer	127,138	8,428	6.6
Leelanau	47,968	4,103	8.6
Lenawee	151,732	17,395	11.5
Livingston	113,272	14,988	13.2
Luce	4,032	1,529	37.9
Mackinac	11,802	2,190	18.6
Macomb	73,040	10,109	13.8
Manistee	46,256	5,831	12.6
Marquette	8,950	3,444	38.5
Mason	55,526	5,448	9.8
Mecosta	90,892	11,372	12.5



Gross payments to farmers and County Agricultural Conservation Association expenses, 1940 conservation program—Continued

## MICHIGAN—continued

County	Gross payments	Association expense	Percent expense is of payments
Oscoda	\$78,368	\$9,023	11.5
Ottawa	128,487	15,287	11.9
Presque Isle	39,772	6,493	16.3
Saginaw	123,047	14,335	11.7
St. Clair	104,669	15,372	14.7
St. Joseph	145,048	11,552	8.0
Sanilac	146,467	18,589	12.7
Schoolcraft	7,393	1,941	26.3
Shiawassee	115,575	13,187	11.4
Tuscola	118,441	12,821	10.8
Van Buren	137,756	23,807	17.3
Washtenaw	148,777	12,124	8.1
Wayne	37,339	11,413	30.6
Wexford	43,462	6,229	14.3
Total or average	6,480,622	775,129	12.0

## MINNESOTA

Aitkin	\$49,661	\$10,243	20.6
Anoka	74,218	8,610	11.6
Becker	185,458	17,346	9.4
Beltrami	62,928	8,508	13.5
Benton	92,598	9,839	10.6
Big Stone	239,212	11,516	4.8
Blue Earth	355,026	25,176	7.1
Brown	313,731	12,722	4.1
Carlton	55,558	12,842	23.1
Carver	180,885	10,424	5.8
Cass	70,191	14,232	20.3
Chippewa	350,606	10,175	29.0
Chisago	102,276	9,427	9.2
Clay	345,108	15,762	4.7
Clearwater	68,401	8,560	12.5
Cottonwood	417,469	19,456	4.7
Crow Wing	52,635	10,589	2.0
Dakota	262,630	11,590	4.4
Dodge	199,055	7,196	3.6
Douglas	191,055	15,052	7.8
Faribault	375,330	20,482	5.5
Fillmore	349,343	25,574	7.3
Freeborn	338,804	15,905	4.7
Goodhue	360,510	17,429	4.8
Grant	244,308	11,387	4.7
Hennepin	131,516	15,037	11.4
Houston	170,374	13,387	7.9
Hubbard	58,722	9,758	16.6
Isanti	129,709	14,136	10.9
Itasca	61,918	13,853	22.4
Jackson	501,568	16,825	3.4
Kanabec	72,615	11,910	16.4
Kandiyohi	371,075	12,829	3.5
Kittson	207,377	8,066	3.9
Koochiching	32,956	6,538	19.8
Lac Qui Parle	385,177	14,981	3.9
Lake	5,795	2,871	49.5
Lake of the Woods	33,108	3,377	10.2
Le Sueur	151,168	10,370	6.9
Lincoln	280,160	18,346	6.5
Lyon	400,045	13,841	3.5
McLeod	209,082	13,853	6.6
Mahnomen	65,629	6,210	9.5
Marshall	337,113	16,759	5.0
Martin	405,997	18,157	4.5
Meeker	253,679	12,314	4.9
Miller	86,958	10,004	11.5
Morrison	193,625	18,649	9.6
Mower	345,826	17,576	5.1
Murray	434,015	17,733	4.1
Nicollet	200,511	10,906	5.4
Nobles	522,157	28,470	5.5
Norman	324,426	9,601	3.0
Olmsted	303,963	16,439	5.4
Otter Tail (E)	270,264	21,871	8.1
Otter Tail (W)	270,294	24,470	9.1
Pennington	145,568	9,841	6.8
Pine	109,205	16,790	15.4
Pipestone	238,332	8,346	3.5
Polk (E)	444,136	11,986	2.7
Polk (W)	181,331	12,292	6.8
Pope	268,478	16,864	6.3
Ramsey	19,543	4,198	21.4
Red Lake	116,406	8,492	7.3
Redwood	478,311	18,671	3.9
Renville	540,466	16,526	3.1
Rice	217,807	13,349	6.1
Rock	217,183	7,315	2.7
Roseau	187,897	18,429	9.8
St. Louis (N)	47,270	15,605	33.0
St. Louis (S)	60,285	11,643	19.3
Scott	132,243	9,172	6.9
Sherburne	103,156	9,499	9.2
Sibley	252,789	12,690	5.0
Stearns	431,081	17,767	4.1
Steele	196,566	8,124	4.1
Stevens	202,003	13,305	6.6
Swift	340,963	10,563	3.1
Todd	211,467	16,780	7.9
Traverse	265,911	5,243	2.0
Wabasha	236,547	15,764	6.7

Gross payments to farmers and County Agricultural Conservation Association expenses, 1940 conservation program—Continued

## MINNESOTA—continued

County	Gross payments	Association expense	Percent expense is of payments
Wadena	\$74,767	\$7,231	9.7
Waseca	136,537	4,949	3.6
Washington	151,550	12,684	8.4
Watsonwan	272,150	17,404	6.4
Wilkin	270,264	6,239	2.3
Winona	211,530	18,339	8.7
Wright	164,225	16,806	10.2
Yellow Medicine	457,526	21,482	4.7
Total or average	20,063,356	1,183,562	5.9

## MISSISSIPPI

Adams	\$63,486	\$5,933	9.3
Alcorn	132,631	9,678	7.3
Amite	147,934	10,421	7.0
Attala	151,232	12,866	8.5
Benton	79,313	8,911	11.2
Bolivar	1,087,835	14,467	1.3
Calhoun	130,539	6,892	5.3
Carroll	143,329	9,599	6.7
Chickasaw	176,199	12,501	7.1
Choctaw	75,970	6,281	8.3
Claiborne	89,244	6,553	7.3
Clarke	84,070	7,198	8.6
Clay	96,841	6,558	6.8
Coahoma	760,478	11,467	1.5
Copiah	158,894	10,468	6.6
Covington	150,701	10,959	7.3
De Soto	312,661	11,347	3.6
Forrest	39,988	4,074	10.2
Franklin	66,038	5,932	9.0
George	34,459	2,098	6.1
Greene	27,254	4,512	16.5
Grenada	97,467	8,987	9.2
Hancock	8,084	695	8.6
Harrison	8,703	3,844	44.2
Hinds	332,387	12,870	3.9
Holmes	342,116	16,883	4.9
Humphreys	407,763	13,013	3.2
Issaquena	137,708	4,833	3.5
Itawamba	129,602	10,199	7.9
Jackson	5,622	2,618	46.6
Jasper	135,450	11,045	8.2
Jefferson	102,889	7,285	7.1
Jefferson Davis	155,281	10,028	6.4
Jones	195,598	9,286	4.7
Kemper	132,153	7,687	5.8
Lafayette	116,873	12,061	10.3
Lamar	63,093	5,062	8.0
Lauderdale	119,942	7,710	6.4
Lawrence	116,223	6,551	5.6
Leake	167,768	11,556	6.9
Lee	229,600	13,537	5.9
Leflore	650,302	12,700	1.9
Lincoln	165,231	10,212	6.2
Lowndes	157,265	9,972	6.3
Madison	313,203	13,362	4.3
Marion	148,266	8,490	5.7
Marshall	190,177	11,288	5.9
Monroe	253,307	12,784	5.0
Montgomery	89,142	10,096	11.3
Neshoba	215,794	12,430	5.8
Newton	158,405	12,737	8.0
Noxubee	158,546	9,005	5.7
Okfuskeena	91,393	8,812	9.6
Panola	293,623	10,350	3.5
Pearl River	82,576	5,274	6.4
Perry	39,207	4,389	11.2
Pike	129,376	10,852	8.4
Pontotoc	188,010	13,221	7.0
Prentiss	124,879	10,871	8.7
Quitman	431,662	13,207	3.0
Rankin	146,430	8,646	5.9
Scott	147,868	8,341	5.6
Sharkey	287,324	6,651	2.3
Simpson	164,375	10,032	6.1
Smith	143,969	12,490	8.7
Stone	16,749	2,768	16.5
Sunflower	1,021,688	20,501	2.0
Tallahatchie	471,981	11,954	2.5
Tato	202,583	10,431	5.1
Tippah	141,268	11,217	7.9
Tishomingo	85,640	10,691	12.5
Tunica	451,146	7,452	1.6
Union	169,561	9,881	5.8
Walthall	173,704	6,726	3.9
Warren	98,148	6,227	6.3
Washington	800,720	20,612	2.6
Wayne	80,774	4,981	6.2
Webster	95,165	8,814	9.3
Wilkinson	60,430	5,484	9.1
Winston	125,205	11,589	9.2
Yalobusha	100,189	8,490	8.5
Yazoo	420,852	13,496	3.2
Total or average	16,299,551	772,056	4.7

Gross payments to farmers and County Agricultural Conservation Association expenses, 1940 conservation program—Continued

## MISSOURI

County	Gross payments	Association expense	Percent expense is of payments
Adair.....	\$150,141	\$15,745	10.5
Andrew.....	143,866	12,056	8.4
Atchison.....	352,175	14,091	4.0
Audrain.....	258,494	15,444	6.0
Barry.....	112,164	14,283	12.7
Barton.....	73,756	10,134	13.7
Bates.....	170,835	21,190	12.4
Benton.....	118,684	13,318	11.2
Bollinger.....	52,200	10,374	19.9
Boone.....	202,664	15,186	7.5
Buchanan.....	131,412	14,989	11.4
Butler.....	125,129	22,438	17.9
Caldwell.....	104,893	13,211	7.9
Callaway.....	158,010	12,161	7.7
Camden.....	31,227	7,411	23.7
Cape Girardeau.....	119,004	16,202	13.6
Carroll.....	208,525	15,965	7.7
Carter.....	20,531	4,104	20.0
Cass.....	144,480	16,807	11.6
Cedar.....	67,132	8,293	12.4
Chariton.....	235,731	17,182	7.3
Christian.....	99,941	9,647	9.7
Clark.....	131,333	12,674	9.7
Clay.....	92,429	9,459	10.2
Clinton.....	155,457	10,556	6.8
Cole.....	68,038	13,629	20.0
Cooper.....	168,817	16,328	9.7
Crawford.....	55,109	10,493	19.0
Dade.....	98,106	8,909	9.1
Dallas.....	70,020	13,735	19.6
Daviess.....	117,086	15,073	12.9
De Kalb.....	148,282	10,206	6.9
Dent.....	53,839	12,947	24.0
Douglas.....	60,725	15,917	26.2
Dunklin.....	599,552	29,538	4.9
Franklin.....	123,887	14,805	12.0
Gasconade.....	53,959	8,527	15.8
Gentry.....	135,691	12,936	9.5
Greene.....	165,421	14,022	8.5
Grundy.....	98,846	13,383	13.5
Harrison.....	192,573	19,152	9.9
Henry.....	145,855	19,936	13.7
Hickory.....	44,042	10,336	23.5
Holt.....	190,014	14,882	7.8
Howard.....	148,724	13,817	9.3
Howell.....	116,275	24,023	20.7
Iron.....	32,865	6,074	18.5
Jackson.....	120,644	18,746	15.5
Jasper.....	104,283	10,307	9.9
Jefferson.....	63,012	11,169	17.7
Johnson.....	167,008	15,921	9.5
Knox.....	176,599	12,934	7.3
Laclede.....	74,563	14,649	19.6
Lafayette.....	298,341	22,489	7.5
Lawrence.....	118,503	15,216	12.8
Lewis.....	161,952	13,221	8.2
Lincoln.....	142,880	14,574	10.2
Linn.....	144,019	16,419	11.4
Livingston.....	136,669	11,393	8.3
McDonald.....	59,304	11,208	18.9
Macon.....	218,340	20,859	9.6
Madison.....	30,536	6,504	21.3
Maries.....	57,077	10,381	18.2
Marion.....	161,575	11,571	7.2
Mercer.....	114,615	15,303	13.4
Miller.....	75,277	10,968	14.6
Mississippi.....	343,700	15,851	4.6
Moniteau.....	100,598	10,189	10.1
Monroe.....	224,588	13,797	6.1
Montgomery.....	126,941	12,546	9.9
Morgan.....	61,225	10,924	17.8
New Madrid.....	735,553	32,515	4.4
Newton.....	96,135	14,483	15.1
Nodaway.....	367,970	22,923	6.2
Oregon.....	83,420	10,203	12.2
Osage.....	70,774	10,979	15.5
Ozark.....	42,906	10,570	24.6
Pemiscot.....	847,433	45,129	5.3
Perry.....	76,593	14,178	18.5
Pettis.....	209,066	14,285	6.8
Phelps.....	56,537	13,835	24.5
Pike.....	203,428	15,259	7.5
Platte.....	158,639	20,155	12.7
Polk.....	113,949	13,961	12.3
Pulaski.....	47,840	10,263	21.5
Putnam.....	116,144	11,191	9.6
Rails.....	159,378	13,562	8.5
Randolph.....	133,014	14,538	10.9
Ray.....	183,545	13,061	7.1
Reynolds.....	39,961	6,985	17.5
Ripley.....	63,966	12,703	19.9
St. Charles.....	135,469	12,595	9.3
St. Clair.....	103,636	13,619	13.1
St. Francois.....	59,667	10,527	17.6
St. Louis.....	60,632	17,177	28.3
Ste. Genevieve.....	37,400	6,972	18.6
Saline.....	306,431	22,810	7.4
Schuyler.....	68,064	10,058	14.8
Scotland.....	107,535	13,038	12.1
Scott.....	224,963	16,468	7.3
Shannon.....	40,886	7,443	18.2
Shelby.....	173,933	15,478	8.9
Stoddard.....	317,279	31,161	9.8

Gross payments to farmers and County Agricultural Conservation Association expenses, 1940 conservation program—Continued

## MISSOURI—continued

County	Gross payments	Association expense	Percent expense is of payments
Stone.....	\$61,833	\$8,261	13.4
Sullivan.....	155,809	18,525	11.9
Taney.....	40,356	9,969	24.7
Texas.....	85,610	19,011	22.2
Vernon.....	111,234	18,102	16.3
Warren.....	41,463	6,931	16.7
Washington.....	44,749	6,965	15.6
Wayne.....	43,707	7,422	17.0
Webster.....	103,273	12,705	12.3
Worth.....	86,281	11,286	13.1
Wright.....	76,228	13,971	18.3
Total or average.....	15,924,207	1,610,019	10.1

## MONTANA

Beaverhead.....	\$38,555	\$4,800	12.4
Big Horn.....	140,801	7,412	5.3
Blaine.....	141,783	7,730	5.5
Broadwater.....	21,467	3,767	17.5
Carbon.....	84,489	8,222	9.7
Carter.....	111,868	7,219	6.5
Cascade.....	160,766	6,035	4.8
Chouteau.....	263,466	10,857	3.0
Custer.....	106,140	8,894	8.4
Daniels.....	210,180	8,228	3.9
Dawson.....	189,016	7,842	4.1
Deer Lodge.....	1,581	882	56.0
Fallon.....	144,143	5,374	3.7
Fergus.....	379,399	12,302	3.2
Flathead.....	70,885	7,612	10.7
Gallatin.....	174,185	7,676	4.4
Garfield.....	135,736	9,424	6.9
Glacier.....	17,284	5,404	32.0
Golden Valley.....	49,667	6,083	12.3
Granite.....	5,741	1,203	21.0
Hill.....	242,815	15,552	4.5
Jefferson.....	15,448	2,518	16.3
Judith Basin.....	171,713	6,343	3.7
Lake.....	60,006	7,553	12.6
Lewis and Clark.....	39,267	4,459	11.4
Liberty.....	82,589	5,945	7.2
Lincoln.....	7,630	4,001	52.4
McCone.....	189,277	9,116	4.8
Madison.....	31,555	5,870	18.6
Meagher.....	39,116	4,395	11.2
Mineral.....	2,658	1,235	46.5
Missoula.....	20,219	5,443	26.9
Musselshell.....	55,572	6,921	12.5
Park.....	66,767	5,754	8.7
Petroleum.....	49,646	4,091	8.2
Phillips.....	142,306	9,013	6.3
Pondera.....	147,518	8,747	5.9
Powder River.....	130,069	10,206	7.8
Powell.....	12,066	2,604	21.5
Prairie.....	65,294	5,282	8.1
Ravalli.....	38,691	5,214	13.4
Richland.....	234,065	6,136	26.2
Roosevelt.....	299,555	12,287	4.1
Rosebud.....	130,783	11,104	8.5
Sanders.....	18,965	5,215	27.5
Sheridan.....	356,941	5,818	1.6
Stillwater.....	134,092	8,392	6.3
Sweet Grass.....	43,809	4,060	9.3
Teton.....	183,840	6,385	3.5
Toole.....	124,850	8,827	7.1
Treasure.....	40,866	3,722	9.1
Valley.....	300,760	13,245	4.4
Wheatland.....	68,952	3,934	5.7
Wibaux.....	104,054	6,532	6.3
Yellowstone.....	209,263	15,081	7.2
Total or average.....	6,507,250	378,066	5.8

## NEBRASKA

Adams.....	\$242,264	\$16,261	6.7
Antelope.....	307,586	23,756	7.7
Arthur, Logan, and McPherson.....	115,122	13,012	11.3
Banner.....	114,374	8,452	7.4
Blaine, Grant, Hooker, and Thomas.....	143,926	14,375	10.0
Boone.....	348,683	19,889	5.7
Box Butte.....	235,870	15,481	6.6
Boyd.....	106,603	7,665	7.2
Brown, Keya Paba, and Rock.....	180,740	18,186	10.1
Buffalo.....	329,989	23,724	7.2
Burt.....	333,713	21,844	6.5
Butler.....	373,245	23,980	6.4
Cass.....	312,530	20,631	6.6
Cedar.....	354,779	19,644	5.5
Chase.....	213,409	12,446	5.8
Cherry.....	195,226	20,156	10.3
Cheyenne.....	348,000	11,469	3.3
Clay.....	283,657	15,194	5.4

Gross payments to farmers and County Agricultural Conservation Association expenses, 1940 conservation program—Continued

## NEBRASKA—continued

County	Gross payments	Association expense	Percent expense is of payments
Colfax.....	\$234,905	\$14,601	6.2
Cumming.....	333,003	21,828	6.6
Custer.....	692,653	41,683	7.0
Dakota.....	148,960	13,409	9.0
Dawes.....	152,610	13,967	9.2
Dawson.....	292,800	21,854	7.5
Deuel.....	130,793	7,980	6.1
Dixon.....	249,888	19,415	7.8
Dodge.....	329,390	17,449	5.3
Douglas.....	131,005	12,250	9.4
Dundy.....	110,259	9,322	8.5
Fillmore.....	298,982	17,453	5.8
Franklin.....	183,827	16,232	8.8
Frontier.....	250,298	19,399	7.8
Furnas.....	264,417	19,855	7.5
Gage.....	323,351	20,209	6.2
Garden.....	127,866	8,672	6.8
Garfield, Loup, and Wheeler.....	97,114	12,366	12.7
Gosper.....	149,247	11,005	7.4
Greeley.....	180,967	18,196	10.5
Hall.....	202,659	15,906	7.9
Hamilton.....	320,168	14,739	4.6
Harlan.....	206,398	16,837	8.2
Hayes.....	141,535	16,157	11.4
Hitchcock.....	179,525	15,031	8.4
Holt.....	202,992	22,773	11.2
Howard.....	187,883	16,183	8.6
Jefferson.....	198,254	15,343	7.7
Johnson.....	133,317	18,093	13.6
Kearney.....	216,599	16,972	7.8
Keith.....	155,201	7,647	4.9
Kimball.....	221,451	8,741	3.9
Knox.....	389,063	24,909	6.4
Lancaster.....	360,600	18,708	5.2
Lincoln.....	303,115	29,194	9.6
Madison.....	323,452	21,379	6.6
Merrick.....	169,131	12,463	7.4
Morrill.....	114,797	11,799	10.3
Nance.....	221,470	13,707	6.2
Nemaha.....	168,710	14,488	8.6
Nuckolls.....	230,633	18,969	8.2
Otoe.....	248,925	14,250	5.7
Pawnee.....	146,675	18,160	12.4
Perkins.....	341,529	8,703	2.8
Phelps.....	235,849	15,126	6.4
Pierce.....	289,601	20,952	7.2
Platte.....	422,068	15,076	3.7
Polk.....	292,664	16,715	5.7
Red Willow.....	219,774	14,363	6.5
Richardson.....	251,025	23,695	9.4
Saline.....	241,863	17,005	7.0
Sarpy.....	119,807	6,830	5.7
Saunders.....	354,219	22,198	6.3
Scotts Bluff.....	135,219	11,071	8.2
Seward.....	344,600	13,585	3.9
Sheridan.....	230,924	16,422	7.1
Sherman.....	203,325	20,204	9.9
Sioux.....	117,016	12,733	10.9
Stanton.....	225,828	15,808	7.0
Thayer.....	218,171	16,350	7.5
Thurston.....	266,090	16,900	6.4
Valley.....	182,031	15,755	8.7
Washington.....	264,243	13,563	5.1
Wayne.....	275,086	18,643	6.7
Webster.....	213,027	16,349	7.7
York.....	357,437	15,990	4.5
Total or average.....	19,968,766	1,391,584	7.0

## NEVADA

Churchill.....	\$19,275	\$2,800	15.0
Clark.....	3,487	1,893	54.3
Douglas.....	8,028	1,012	12.6
Elko.....	47,732	3,987	8.4
Eureka.....	5,560	767	13.8
Humboldt.....	13,350	1,444	10.8
Lander.....	4,518	731	16.2
Lincoln.....	1,944	1,356	69.8
Lyon.....	18,123	2,386	13.2
Mineral.....	1,788	286	16.0
Nye.....	7,636	1,752	22.9
Ormsby.....	241	46	19.1
Perkins.....	10,516	1,942	18.5
Storey.....	114	64	56.1
Washoe.....	14,892	2,098	14.1
White Pine.....	11,604	2,922	25.2
Total or average.....	168,808	25,576	15.2

## NEW HAMPSHIRE

Belknap.....	\$20,677	\$3,463	16.7
Carroll.....	19,023	2,150	11.3
Cheshire.....	30,546	5,025	16.4
Coos.....	48,756	5,906	12.1
Grafton.....	55,478	8,183	14.7
Hillsboro.....	51,627	7,290	14.1
Merrimack.....	36,212	5,549	15.3

Gross payments to farmers and County Agricultural Conservation Association expenses, 1940 conservation program—Continued

## NEW HAMPSHIRE—continued

County	Gross payments	Association expense	Percent expense is of payments
Rockingham.....	\$63,340	\$8,621	13.6
Strafford.....	20,085	2,963	14.8
Sullivan.....	24,375	3,785	15.5
Total or average.....	370,039	52,935	14.3

## NEW JERSEY

Atlantic.....	\$29,276	\$4,891	16.7
Bergen.....	13,686	1,291	9.4
Burlington.....	104,723	8,279	7.9
Camden.....	30,099	4,022	13.4
Cape May.....	9,621	1,819	18.9
Cumberland.....	106,728	11,764	11.0
Essex.....	5,068	404	8.0
Gloucester.....	101,046	11,450	11.3
Hunterdon.....	66,751	7,008	10.5
Mercer.....	53,161	6,199	11.7
Middlesex.....	55,165	5,945	10.8
Monmouth.....	112,131	9,114	8.1
Morris.....	19,836	2,233	11.2
Ocean.....	8,726	1,428	16.4
Passaic.....	8,225	752	9.1
Salem.....	71,219	5,788	8.1
Somerset.....	26,432	2,557	9.7
Sussex.....	48,873	4,125	8.4
Union.....	3,392	393	11.7
Warren.....	37,868	3,104	8.2
Total or average.....	912,026	92,571	10.1

## NEW MEXICO

Bernalillo.....	\$20,522	\$7,308	35.6
Catron.....	49,148	5,250	10.7
Chaves.....	281,465	17,365	6.2
Colfax.....	113,158	10,619	9.4
Curry.....	257,681	11,404	4.4
De Baca.....	63,026	5,884	9.3
Dona Ana.....	281,464	21,263	7.6
Eddy.....	200,498	14,608	7.3
Grant.....	28,740	3,818	13.3
Guadalupe.....	72,506	8,117	11.2
Harding.....	78,726	8,477	10.8
Hidalgo.....	30,848	3,223	10.4
Lea.....	82,911	5,331	6.4
Lincoln.....	59,726	6,720	11.3
Luna.....	32,000	3,714	11.6
McKinley.....	33,285	3,249	9.8
Mora.....	45,476	6,814	15.0
Otero.....	45,558	3,729	8.2
Quay.....	186,939	18,403	9.9
Rio Arriba.....	20,838	9,075	43.6
Roosevelt.....	230,234	22,013	9.6
Sandoval.....	12,494	7,463	59.7
San Juan.....	14,473	5,572	38.5
San Miguel.....	82,459	11,412	13.8
Santa Fe.....	26,034	5,520	21.2
Sierra.....	18,763	5,666	30.2
Socorro.....	50,232	11,535	23.0
Taos.....	7,714	4,567	59.3
Torrance.....	70,979	11,051	15.6
Union.....	201,609	16,370	8.1
Valencia.....	90,367	12,285	13.6
Total or average.....	2,880,873	286,725	9.9

## NEW YORK

Albany.....	\$46,593	\$4,562	9.8
Allegany.....	111,934	9,998	8.9
Broome.....	76,111	9,580	12.6
Cattaraugus.....	136,443	17,027	12.5
Cayuga.....	83,216	12,522	15.0
Chautauqua.....	143,777	14,550	10.1
Chemung.....	51,963	6,574	12.6
Chenango.....	114,527	12,774	11.1
Clinton.....	70,909	7,473	10.5
Columbia.....	69,188	6,396	9.2
Cortland.....	78,754	8,599	10.9
Delaware.....	141,087	8,794	6.2
Dutchess.....	73,407	4,722	6.4
Erie.....	84,293	10,318	12.2
Essex.....	20,700	2,135	10.3
Franklin.....	68,194	8,176	12.0
Fulton.....	17,776	1,891	10.6
Genesee.....	65,715	9,765	14.8
Greene.....	53,133	5,086	9.6
Herkimer.....	44,109	4,053	9.2
Levy.....	128,637	8,226	6.3
Jewett.....	64,304	3,504	5.5
Livingston.....	79,029	9,776	12.7
Madison.....	81,729	10,352	12.6
Monroe.....	75,775	10,829	14.3
Montgomery.....	35,141	3,345	9.5
Nassau.....	67,823	3,810	8.6



Gross payments to farmers and County Agricultural Conservation Association expenses, 1940 conservation program—Continued

## NEW YORK—continued

County	Gross payments	Association expense	Percent expense is of payments
Niagara.....	\$82,792	\$14,160	17.1
Onondaga.....	128,466	15,481	12.0
Orangetown.....	110,423	14,233	12.8
Ontario.....	63,529	15,414	24.3
Orange.....	103,360	10,964	10.6
Orleans.....	83,752	10,763	12.8
Oswego.....	85,030	12,102	14.2
Otsego.....	112,314	10,956	9.7
Rensselaer.....	59,771	4,408	7.4
Rockland.....	9,111	476	5.2
St. Lawrence.....	172,434	11,100	6.4
Saratoga.....	42,637	5,727	13.4
Schenectady.....	19,879	2,296	11.5
Schoharie.....	59,926	6,529	10.9
Schuyler.....	40,189	4,472	11.1
Seneca.....	66,200	9,494	14.3
Steuben.....	209,444	25,602	12.2
Suffolk.....	133,658	11,724	8.8
Sullivan.....	49,963	5,350	10.7
Tioga.....	69,053	5,465	7.9
Tompkins.....	53,315	7,566	14.1
Ulster.....	70,789	10,490	14.8
Warren.....	2,995	324	10.8
Washington.....	94,833	8,715	9.2
Wayne.....	136,237	18,174	13.3
Westchester.....	20,137	3,682	18.3
Wyoming.....	88,076	11,284	12.8
Yates.....	44,520	7,349	16.5
Total or average.....	4,297,300	479,237	11.2

## NORTH CAROLINA

Alamance.....	\$81,631	\$18,756	23.0
Alexander.....	72,258	9,004	12.5
Alleghany.....	45,574	5,388	11.8
Anson.....	217,681	17,087	7.8
Ashe.....	87,871	11,854	13.5
Avery.....	39,978	7,112	17.8
Beaufort.....	183,396	29,873	16.3
Bertie.....	117,060	15,037	12.8
Bladen.....	131,896	21,875	16.6
Brunswick.....	49,818	12,238	24.6
Buncombe.....	81,372	13,933	17.1
Burke.....	34,655	7,852	22.6
Cabarrus.....	128,372	10,443	8.1
Caldwell.....	39,440	8,387	21.3
Camden.....	46,169	4,373	9.5
Carteret.....	33,665	7,714	22.9
Caswell.....	125,974	13,199	10.5
Catawba.....	143,728	12,065	8.4
Chatham.....	96,822	13,596	14.0
Cherokee.....	31,548	6,646	21.1
Chowan.....	44,688	7,399	16.5
Clay.....	19,438	3,271	16.8
Cleveland.....	302,883	23,570	6.0
Columbus.....	281,449	35,769	12.7
Craven.....	126,437	20,724	16.4
Cumberland.....	208,500	15,528	7.4
Currituck.....	34,836	4,211	12.1
Dare.....	777	27	3.5
Davidson.....	113,222	21,952	19.4
Davie.....	83,600	12,969	15.5
Duplin.....	275,292	38,570	14.0
Durham.....	61,415	10,484	17.1
Edgecombe.....	293,629	21,779	7.4
Forsyth.....	98,288	24,471	24.9
Franklin.....	254,580	25,239	9.9
Gaston.....	125,443	10,957	8.7
Gates.....	52,491	7,427	14.1
Graham.....	11,110	3,179	28.6
Granville.....	183,818	26,066	14.0
Greene.....	198,212	13,101	6.6
Guilford.....	152,192	19,743	13.0
Hallfax.....	232,061	33,874	14.6
Harnett.....	325,274	44,949	13.8
Haywood.....	62,179	10,439	16.8
Henderson.....	42,377	6,700	15.8
Hertford.....	82,659	12,137	14.7
Hoke.....	158,122	12,060	8.0
Hyde.....	40,611	6,303	15.5
Iredell.....	240,219	19,378	8.1
Jackson.....	37,369	4,960	13.3
Johnston.....	536,158	51,784	9.7
Jones.....	96,465	12,541	13.0
Lee.....	87,098	9,745	11.2
Lenoir.....	244,258	12,926	5.3
Lincoln.....	161,245	10,318	6.4
McDowell.....	19,157	2,857	14.9
Macon.....	37,982	5,128	13.5
Madison.....	83,738	21,769	26.0
Martin.....	156,616	12,676	8.1
Mecklenburg.....	194,297	17,029	8.8
Mitchell.....	37,596	5,653	15.0
Montgomery.....	59,067	6,410	10.8
Moore.....	85,811	11,849	13.8
Nash.....	365,598	26,790	7.3
New Hanover.....	12,160	5,365	44.1
Northampton.....	137,071	20,185	14.7
Onslow.....	108,230	15,834	14.6
Orange.....	67,537	10,004	14.8

LXXXVIII—255

Gross payments to farmers and County Agricultural Conservation Association expenses, 1940 conservation program—Continued

## NORTH CAROLINA—continued

County	Gross payments	Association expense	Percent expense is of payments
Pamlico.....	\$63,702	\$9,065	14.2
Pasquotank.....	41,325	5,239	12.7
Pender.....	62,086	17,940	28.9
Perquimans.....	57,740	7,641	13.2
Person.....	127,536	19,983	15.7
Pitt.....	388,554	36,676	9.4
Polk.....	44,658	8,052	18.0
Randolph.....	89,354	14,400	16.1
Richmond.....	121,352	13,441	10.8
Robeson.....	585,225	49,766	8.5
Rockingham.....	183,408	32,908	17.9
Rowan.....	173,276	25,531	14.7
Rutherford.....	195,273	21,222	10.9
Sampson.....	415,636	47,780	11.5
Scotland.....	172,859	9,791	5.7
Stanly.....	114,864	11,191	9.7
Stokes.....	162,932	27,040	16.6
Surry.....	154,145	26,707	17.3
Swain.....	13,374	4,289	32.1
Transylvania.....	19,797	3,149	15.9
Tyrrell.....	24,369	3,742	15.3
Union.....	316,436	18,908	6.0
Vance.....	136,383	18,027	13.6
Wake.....	346,718	41,803	12.1
Warren.....	175,382	29,159	16.6
Washington.....	37,918	5,946	15.7
Watauga.....	56,284	6,458	15.0
Wayne.....	341,628	34,116	10.0
Wilkes.....	63,769	17,796	27.9
Wilson.....	314,819	24,955	7.9
Yadkin.....	132,741	31,092	23.4
Yancey.....	45,276	6,994	15.4
Total or average.....	13,694,042	1,636,098	11.9

## NORTH DAKOTA

Adams.....	\$187,459	\$13,025	6.9
Barnes.....	438,795	18,373	4.2
Benson.....	374,791	17,017	4.5
Billings.....	79,919	6,230	7.8
Bottineau.....	409,847	11,634	2.8
Bowman.....	146,355	12,391	8.5
Burke.....	245,405	18,455	7.5
Burlington.....	209,639	17,250	8.2
Cass.....	723,327	21,500	3.0
Cavalier.....	466,268	13,775	3.0
Dickey.....	245,689	13,222	5.4
Divide.....	300,205	14,406	4.8
Dunn.....	237,793	19,424	8.2
Eddy.....	137,958	6,207	4.5
Emmons.....	265,071	20,866	7.9
Foster.....	158,517	7,645	4.8
Golden Valley.....	135,145	9,193	6.8
Grand Forks.....	512,723	17,574	3.4
Grant.....	236,908	15,781	6.7
Griggs.....	199,031	8,033	4.0
Hettinger.....	254,137	14,080	5.5
Kidder.....	209,212	14,836	7.1
La Moure.....	308,480	19,997	6.5
Logan.....	169,717	10,473	6.2
McHenry.....	350,489	17,167	4.9
McIntosh.....	189,447	13,748	7.3
McKenzie.....	268,611	15,644	5.8
McLean.....	471,529	13,173	2.8
Mercer.....	156,033	17,299	11.1
Morton.....	260,800	28,005	10.7
Mountrail.....	314,080	21,172	6.7
Nelson.....	305,806	12,282	4.0
Oliver.....	95,300	13,160	13.8
Pembina.....	361,892	18,112	5.0
Pierce.....	280,715	13,051	4.6
Ramsey.....	432,994	17,716	4.1
Ransom.....	211,313	15,429	7.3
Renville.....	238,054	14,898	6.3
Richland.....	441,604	18,560	4.2
Rolette.....	166,716	11,071	6.6
Sargent.....	225,440	16,732	7.4
Sheridan.....	199,993	8,919	4.5
Sioux.....	90,765	10,134	11.2
Slope.....	153,700	8,985	5.8
Stark.....	290,463	13,843	4.8
Steele.....	226,389	7,251	4.2
Stutsman.....	529,987	14,531	2.7
Towner.....	327,882	10,257	3.1
Traill.....	376,033	13,373	3.6
Walsh.....	461,749	17,471	3.8
Ward.....	455,432	19,074	4.2
Wells.....	387,891	12,634	3.3
Williams.....	389,773	26,989	6.9
Total or average.....	15,312,861	782,065	5.1

## OHIO

Adams.....	\$122,258	\$12,654	10.4
Allen.....	119,259	12,536	10.5
Ashland.....	119,446	12,860	10.8
Ashtabula.....	139,321	20,394	14.6

Gross payments to farmers and County Agricultural Conservation Association expenses, 1940 conservation program—Continued

## OHIO—continued

County	Gross payments	Associa- tion expense	Percent expense is of pay- ments
Athens.....	\$38,950	\$11,688	30.0
Auglaize.....	182,293	11,773	6.5
Belmont.....	66,811	17,062	25.6
Brown.....	142,500	13,382	9.4
Butler.....	177,612	11,151	6.3
Carroll.....	54,684	12,572	23.0
Champaign.....	204,708	6,895	3.4
Clark.....	195,315	9,451	4.9
Clermont.....	151,611	12,897	8.5
Clinton.....	206,574	7,979	3.9
Columbiana.....	103,966	12,842	12.4
Coshocton.....	112,544	16,955	15.1
Crawford.....	135,857	11,258	8.3
Cuyahoga.....	25,605	6,728	26.3
Darke.....	227,242	16,869	7.4
Defiance.....	104,511	11,464	11.0
Delaware.....	164,662	11,392	6.9
Erie.....	72,592	9,757	13.4
Fairfield.....	212,197	10,718	5.1
Fayette.....	218,170	5,463	2.5
Franklin.....	173,518	10,743	6.2
Fulton.....	91,475	12,080	13.2
Gallia.....	69,116	12,967	18.8
Geauga.....	64,502	12,126	18.8
Greene.....	219,846	9,018	4.1
Guernsey.....	78,417	14,400	18.4
Hamilton.....	48,731	8,380	17.2
Hancock.....	175,651	12,661	7.2
Hardin.....	166,512	12,709	7.6
Harrison.....	39,387	7,895	20.0
Henry.....	186,076	10,760	5.8
Highland.....	138,510	9,168	6.6
Hocking.....	29,852	6,141	20.6
Holmes.....	74,008	7,864	10.6
Huron.....	114,683	9,954	8.7
Jackson.....	66,888	6,626	9.9
Jefferson.....	32,511	9,735	29.9
Knox.....	158,300	10,096	6.4
Lake.....	25,268	6,732	26.6
Lawrence.....	50,279	11,055	22.0
Licking.....	206,524	19,587	9.5
Logan.....	164,392	11,897	7.2
Lorain.....	137,723	11,952	8.7
Lucas.....	77,893	9,983	12.8
Madison.....	241,382	7,274	3.0
Mahoning.....	67,799	13,810	20.4
Marion.....	175,834	11,818	6.7
Medina.....	102,189	11,241	11.0
Meigs.....	59,438	11,992	20.2
Mercer.....	197,613	10,921	5.5
Miami.....	160,594	10,356	6.4
Monroe.....	50,373	9,899	19.7
Montgomery.....	180,873	13,869	7.7
Morgan.....	37,509	9,760	26.1
Morrow.....	122,384	11,960	9.8
Muskingum.....	147,512	18,417	12.5
Noble.....	56,541	11,263	19.9
Ottawa.....	47,324	10,208	21.6
Paulding.....	154,254	12,751	8.3
Perry.....	83,976	9,721	11.6
Pickaway.....	265,058	12,114	4.6
Pike.....	82,066	8,615	10.5
Portage.....	113,855	13,128	11.5
Preble.....	202,530	12,235	6.0
Putnam.....	222,114	18,999	8.5
Richland.....	122,041	12,904	10.6
Ross.....	248,289	14,240	5.7
Sandusky.....	145,376	9,414	6.5
Scioto.....	90,506	11,112	12.3
Seneca.....	193,495	15,180	7.8
Shelby.....	168,948	10,025	5.9
Stark.....	114,483	16,616	14.5
Summit.....	53,371	13,415	25.1
Trumbull.....	126,331	16,831	13.3
Tuscarawas.....	100,208	17,754	17.7
Union.....	170,568	11,820	6.9
Van Wert.....	159,457	10,654	6.7
Vinton.....	21,430	7,995	37.3
Warren.....	145,706	16,902	7.5
Washington.....	79,753	26,814	26.1
Wayne.....	161,728	14,447	8.9
Williams.....	118,979	11,032	9.3
Wood.....	227,531	20,692	9.1
Wyandot.....	133,264	11,853	8.9

Gross payments to farmers and County Agricultural Conservation Association expenses, 1940 conservation program—Continued

## OKLAHOMA—continued

County	Gross payments	Association expense	Percent expense is of payments
Choctaw	\$119,114	\$16,338	13.7
Cimarron	302,729	10,556	3.5
Cleveland	113,607	9,911	8.7
Coal	81,368	9,991	12.3
Comanche	216,970	13,144	6.0
Cotton	222,745	12,099	5.4
Craig	114,063	14,814	13.0
Creek	147,294	18,196	12.3
Custer	247,400	12,182	4.9
Delaware	64,128	11,955	18.6
Dewey	202,513	10,488	5.2
Ellis	227,762	12,447	5.5
Garfield	141,530	9,607	6.8
Garvin	264,544	22,052	8.3
Grady	408,176	18,992	4.6
Grant	150,212	7,680	5.1
Greer	272,887	10,252	3.7
Harmon	226,373	10,024	4.4
Harper	216,711	11,882	5.5
Haskell	110,095	9,882	9.0
Hughes	176,904	15,422	8.7
Jackson	382,567	13,164	3.4
Jefferson	202,712	13,045	6.4
Johnston	101,323	11,283	11.1
Kay	95,161	5,930	6.2
Kingfisher	171,056	9,407	5.5
Kiowa	391,689	16,347	4.2
Latimer	31,318	4,456	14.2
LeFlore	158,896	17,363	10.9
Lincoln	179,639	19,849	11.0
Logan	130,272	12,787	9.8
Love	110,704	9,069	8.2
McClain	228,305	16,412	7.2
McCurry	150,917	16,019	10.6
McIntosh	208,778	17,434	8.3
Major	127,730	10,818	9.2
Marshall	86,731	7,361	8.5
Mayes	95,634	11,445	12.0
Murray	74,641	7,229	9.7
Muskogee	255,505	16,508	6.5
Noble	78,970	4,950	6.3
Nowata	53,471	5,223	9.8
Okfuskee	180,117	13,920	7.7
Oklahoma	103,338	8,416	8.1
Oklmulgee	162,943	12,246	7.5
Osage	188,203	14,319	7.6
Ottawa	47,819	9,498	19.9
Pawnee	70,574	7,791	11.0
Payne	113,375	9,880	8.7
Pittsburg	168,275	15,179	9.0
Pontotoc	139,644	18,370	13.1
Pottawatomie	164,432	13,511	8.2
Pushmataha	65,735	8,621	13.1
Roger Mills	269,168	13,333	4.9
Rogers	77,652	9,029	11.6
Seminole	120,705	12,768	10.6
Sequoyah	101,641	10,790	10.6
Stephens	216,295	14,846	6.9
Texas	590,870	15,572	2.6
Tillman	455,290	10,643	2.3
Tulsa	73,600	11,654	15.8
Wagoner	179,274	15,879	8.8
Washington	31,245	8,305	26.5
Washita	454,942	20,010	4.4
Woods	234,127	6,884	2.9
Woodward	189,740	11,730	6.2
Total or average	14,307,299	954,438	6.7

## OREGON

County	Gross payments	Association expense	Percent expense is of payments
Baker	\$123,647	\$7,160	5.8
Benton	64,247	9,755	15.2
Clackamas	118,607	27,475	23.2
Clatsop	7,956	990	12.4
Columbia	29,897	6,750	22.6
Coos	37,016	4,727	12.8
Crook	63,433	4,957	7.8
Curry	13,318	769	5.8
Deschutes	39,751	7,878	19.8
Douglas	77,769	12,456	16.0
Gilliam	116,774	3,284	2.8
Grant	25,521	2,409	9.4
Harney	41,278	5,487	13.3
Hood River	25,138	1,824	7.3
Jackson	75,081	6,656	8.9
Jefferson	42,785	1,727	4.0
Josephine	25,303	3,536	14.0
Klamath	154,131	9,245	6.0
Lake	35,364	5,758	16.3
Lane	115,222	20,164	17.5
Lincoln	115,154	2,755	18.1
Linn	160,167	15,349	9.6
Malheur	90,016	9,518	10.6
Marion	186,121	32,529	17.4
Morrow	165,243	3,197	1.9
Multnomah	25,500	3,824	14.9
Polk	116,128	16,644	14.3

Gross payments to farmers and County Agricultural Conservation Association expenses, 1940 conservation program—Continued

## OREGON—continued

County	Gross payments	Association expense	Percent expense is of payments
Sherman	\$194,112	\$371	0.2
Tillamook	19,966	3,624	18.2
Umatilla	520,221	15,311	2.9
Union	107,289	6,300	5.9
Wallowa	68,297	6,415	9.4
Wasco	109,738	6,212	5.7
Washington	114,231	40,635	35.6
Wheeler	21,732	2,064	9.5
Yamhill	140,568	30,913	22.0
Total or average	3,286,811	338,468	10.3

## PENNSYLVANIA

County	Gross payments	Association expense	Percent expense is of payments
Adams	\$111,301	\$11,437	10.3
Allegheny	36,879	7,444	20.2
Armstrong	61,197	8,504	13.4
Beaver	30,162	3,852	12.8
Bedford	71,416	8,149	11.4
Berks	137,650	16,633	12.1
Blair	47,586	6,907	14.5
Bradford	149,000	16,149	10.8
Bucks	71,730	9,342	13.0
Butler	103,396	13,744	13.3
Cambria	59,777	8,693	14.5
Cameron	2,070	294	14.2
Carbon	26,195	3,371	12.9
Centre	40,870	5,511	13.5
Chester	137,045	14,027	10.2
Clarion	66,522	8,735	13.2
Clearfield	39,507	5,702	14.4
Columbia	18,934	3,693	19.5
Crawford	57,557	8,844	15.4
Cumberland	125,308	14,360	11.4
Dauphin	102,927	9,842	9.6
Delaware	63,170	6,787	10.7
Elk	12,114	1,583	13.1
Erie	15,454	2,188	14.1
Fayette	137,257	17,399	12.7
Forest	62,604	9,666	15.4
Fulton	6,160	1,181	19.2
Franklin	139,674	12,907	9.2
Greene	45,747	5,378	11.7
Huntingdon	67,662	10,552	15.6
Indiana	61,851	8,184	13.2
Jefferson	118,892	14,320	12.0
Juniata	68,095	9,290	13.6
Lackawanna	41,506	5,074	12.2
Lancaster	34,821	4,258	12.2
Lawrence	305,729	26,726	8.7
Lebanon	62,542	10,639	17.0
Lehigh	67,382	7,102	10.5
Luzerne	90,676	11,023	12.1
Lycoming	57,979	9,615	16.6
McKean	87,364	11,614	13.3
Mercer	17,144	2,027	11.8
Mifflin	134,886	16,128	11.9
Monroe	20,412	3,221	15.8
Montgomery	19,180	3,876	20.2
Northampton	31,939	7,901	24.7
Northumberland	21,759	3,470	15.9
Perry	57,711	9,861	17.1
Philadelphia	64,572	6,926	10.7
Pike	57,832	4,354	7.5
Potter	4,069	282	6.9
Pott	6,065	2,074	34.2
Schuylkill	50,865	5,495	10.8
Snyder	64,409	7,624	11.8
Somerset	41,156	5,370	13.0
Sullivan	102,570	8,600	8.3
Susquehanna	22,320	3,125	14.0
Tioga	110,499	11,831	10.7
Union	110,168	10,661	9.7
Venango	33,138	4,823	14.5
Warren	41,999	6,067	14.4
Washington	46,698	7,361	15.8
Wayne	85,832	12,360	14.4
Westmoreland	83,152	8,726	10.5
Wyoming	118,634	16,771	14.1
York	37,734	3,659	9.7
Total or average	4,576,649	554,217	12.1

## RHODE ISLAND

County	Gross payments	Association expense	Percent expense is of payments
Bristol	\$1,924	\$484	25.1
Kent	7,316	2,296	31.4
Newport	14,955	3,195	21.4
Providence	21,283	3,885	18.2
Washington	16,420	2,881	17.5
Total or average	61,898	12,741	20.6

Gross payments to farmers and County Agricultural Conservation Association expenses, 1940 conservation program—Continued

## SOUTH CAROLINA

County	Gross payments	Association expense	Percent expense is of payments
Abbeville	\$137,408	\$7,865	5.7
Aiken	299,695	15,426	5.1
Allendale	104,037	7,712	7.4
Anderson	510,636	21,712	4.3
Bamberg	162,938	7,735	4.7
Barnwell	210,766	9,835	4.7
Beaufort	31,926	4,546	14.2
Berkeley	56,640	5,781	10.2
Calhoun	175,031	8,755	5.0
Charleston	23,559	10,516	44.6
Cherokee	200,570	14,287	7.1
Chester	160,068	7,726	4.8
Chesterfield	279,455	18,776	6.7
Clarendon	225,735	18,794	8.3
Colleton	131,512	10,355	7.8
Darlington	309,275	20,131	6.5
Dillon	252,740	12,720	5.0
Dorchester	81,016	6,473	8.0
Edgefield	136,661	9,194	6.7
Fairfield	103,099	11,508	11.2
Florence	354,366	33,757	9.5
Georgetown	38,337	4,940	12.9
Greenville	360,234	16,622	4.6
Greenwood	108,692	6,735	6.2
Hampton	107,204	9,628	9.0
Horry	315,419	29,615	9.4
Jasper	22,486	4,709	21.0
Kershaw	199,919	16,734	8.4
Lancaster	150,020	9,417	6.3
Laurens	287,240	16,699	5.8
Lee	266,539	11,007	4.1
Lexington	175,238	9,066	5.2
McCormick	63,258	5,951	9.4
Marion	165,462	5,721	3.4
Marlboro	294,987	16,675	5.6
Newberry	175,267	11,874	6.8
Oconee	179,292	8,727	4.9
Orangeburg	560,599	19,693	3.5
Pickens	185,477	10,754	5.8
Richland	107,614	7,037	6.5
Sajuda	139,510	6,443	4.6
Spartanburg	488,653	29,178	6.0
Sumter	308,379	25,887	8.4
Union	115,345	9,347	8.1
Williamsburg	278,128	24,470	8.8
York	248,760	13,031	5.2
Total or average	9,289,192	593,564	6.4

## SOUTH DAKOTA

Aurora	\$158,955	\$10,596	6.7
Beadle	321,891	28,780	8.9
Bennett	152,259	14,191	9.3
Bon Homme	231,880	16,872	7.3
Brookings	362,943	15,396	4.2
Brown	519,724	24,102	4.6
Brule and Buffalo	172,960	22,687	13.1
Butte	124,262	16,766	13.5
Campbell	152,969	9,334	6.1
Charles Mix	325,410	17,634	5.4
Clark	309,086	10,899	3.5
Clay	214,434	12,595	5.9
Codington	237,177	12,360	5.2
Corson	224,675	18,329	8.2
Custer	58,020	9,225	15.9
Davison	151,923	7,464	4.9
Day	347,129	13,534	3.9
Deuel	234,640	9,410	4.0
Dewey	137,905	10,903	7.9
Douglas	138,175	8,946	6.5
Edmunds	226,172	19,473	8.6
Fall River	111,034	12,421	11.2
Faulk	207,376	12,054	5.8
Grant	234,952	5,801	2.5
Gregory	201,270	19,472	9.7
Haakon	144,155	12,135	8.4
Hamlin	220,386	11,957	5.4
Hand	260,918	18,840	7.2
Hanson	134,878	8,891	6.6
Harding	137,293	13,963	9.9
Hughes and Stanley	149,774	15,713	10.5
Hutchinson	275,600	19,296	7.0
Hyde	96,553	7,614	7.9
Jackson and Wash-			
baugh	119,739	8,621	7.2
Jerauld	124,198	9,726	7.8
Jones	81,710	9,627	11.8
Kingsbury	309,643	12,432	4.0
Lake	270,821	9,920	3.7
Lawrence	46,161	7,129	15.4
Lincoln	289,292	6,144	2.1
Lyman	190,312	14,484	7.6
McCook	232,337	13,049	5.6
McPherson	191,918	13,718	7.1
Marshall	221,216	9,572	4.3
Meade	306,519	33,503	10.9
Mellette	121,766	13,234	10.9



Gross payments to farmers and County Agricultural Conservation Association expenses, 1940 conservation program—Continued

## SOUTH DAKOTA—continued

County	Gross payments	Association expense	Percent expense is of payments
Miner	\$186,643	\$12,748	6.8
Minnehaha	398,063	11,537	2.9
Moody	235,260	13,489	5.7
Pennington	190,403	19,369	10.2
Perkins	253,268	26,238	10.4
Potter	189,965	12,850	6.8
Roberts	320,105	16,017	5.0
Sanborn	159,378	10,147	6.4
Shannon and Washington	78,084	8,219	10.5
Spink	427,313	19,405	4.5
Sully	180,630	13,006	7.2
Todd	118,213	13,177	11.1
Tripp	316,806	20,553	6.5
Turner	287,562	13,950	4.9
Union	261,127	13,479	5.2
Walworth	150,275	7,275	4.8
Yankton	193,338	13,051	6.8
Ziebach	129,061	15,234	11.8
Total or average	13,558,915	888,156	6.6

## TENNESSEE

Anderson	\$24,959	\$5,282	21.2
Bedford	81,728	5,811	7.1
Benton	67,236	11,629	17.3
Bledsoe	30,639	2,685	8.8
Blount	62,444	8,431	13.5
Bradley	53,840	8,349	15.5
Campbell	25,482	6,035	23.7
Cannon	33,503	5,363	16.0
Carroll	196,795	24,475	12.4
Carter	51,376	7,993	15.6
Cheatham	30,911	5,418	17.5
Chester	95,912	9,659	10.1
Claiborne	78,395	13,424	17.1
Clay	41,276	8,519	20.6
Cocke	61,062	13,495	22.1
Coffee	64,833	8,941	13.8
Crockett	228,537	17,014	7.4
Cumberland	33,402	3,921	11.7
Davidson	59,266	14,076	23.8
Deatur	64,891	8,912	13.7
De Kalb	60,084	12,085	20.1
Dickson	83,744	11,511	13.7
Dyer	347,396	18,381	5.3
Fayette	306,300	22,854	7.5
Fentress	21,235	3,402	16.0
Franklin	99,717	10,546	10.6
Gibson	409,850	29,648	7.1
Giles	154,103	27,620	17.9
Grainger	50,016	13,840	27.7
Greene	124,601	25,596	19.0
Grundy	12,280	1,707	14.0
Hamblen	57,273	10,250	17.9
Hamilton	31,079	7,110	22.2
Hancock	36,536	7,365	20.2
Hardeman	181,055	19,657	10.9
Hardin	85,159	11,438	13.4
Hawkins	54,858	18,523	33.8
Haywood	312,994	25,973	8.3
Henderson	169,499	21,547	12.7
Henry	176,710	16,680	9.4
Hickman	38,604	6,710	17.4
Houston	23,603	2,488	10.5
Humphreys	43,857	3,758	8.6
Jackson	35,960	9,244	25.7
Jefferson	71,175	10,845	15.2
Johnson	49,740	7,991	16.1
Knox	69,616	14,361	20.6
Lake	161,488	9,639	6.0
Lauderdale	268,493	20,476	7.6
Lawrence	208,006	22,461	10.8
Lewis	11,514	2,542	22.1
Lincoln	163,952	20,602	12.6
Loudon	51,291	5,529	10.8
McMinn	101,242	10,884	10.8
McNairy	170,644	19,088	11.2
Macon	45,778	8,377	18.3
Madison	269,566	23,490	8.7
Marion	25,464	3,441	13.5
Marshall	67,817	7,764	13.4
Maury	124,715	16,519	13.2
Meigs	24,000	4,956	20.7
Monroe	55,672	8,900	16.0
Montgomery	159,706	17,643	11.0
Moore	27,407	4,936	18.0
Morgan	17,072	4,667	27.3
Obion	204,411	18,603	9.1
Overton	63,289	12,960	20.5
Perry	24,028	4,952	20.6
Pickett	22,856	5,159	22.7
Polk	41,982	5,041	12.0
Putnam	62,746	8,786	14.0
Rhea	29,516	3,223	12.5
Roane	59,007	5,556	14.2
Robertson	148,869	15,771	10.6
Rutherford	146,198	19,627	13.4

Gross payments to farmers and County Agricultural Conservation Association expenses, 1940 conservation program—Continued

## TENNESSEE—continued

County	Gross payments	Association expense	Percent expense is of payments
Scott	\$13,675	\$2,768	20.2
Sequatchie	10,143	327	3.2
Seyler	72,247	11,338	15.7
Shelby	404,631	27,215	6.7
Smith	72,483	12,771	17.6
Stewart	57,918	8,881	15.3
Sullivan	64,557	9,755	15.1
Sumner	132,301	21,062	15.9
Tipton	367,101	24,209	6.6
Trousdale	33,102	3,252	9.8
Union	11,231	3,249	28.9
Van Buren	27,331	5,942	21.7
Warren	11,615	1,797	15.5
Washington	64,437	13,245	20.6
Wayne	86,975	16,196	18.6
Weakley	47,899	12,960	27.1
White	178,661	11,686	6.5
White	65,490	8,177	12.5
Williamson	91,290	19,143	21.0
Wilson	107,488	15,849	14.7
Total or average	9,148,583	1,101,476	12.0

## TEXAS

Anderson	\$201,317	\$20,749	10.3
Andrews	33,159	916	2.8
Angelina	100,714	23,043	22.9
Aransas	7,284	582	8.0
Archer	86,120	5,806	6.7
Armstrong	163,708	2,785	1.7
Atascosa	184,002	11,888	6.5
Austin	174,406	14,477	8.3
Bailey	290,128	11,015	3.8
Bandera	54,662	5,016	10.7
Bastrop	155,253	16,384	10.5
Baylor	143,146	7,463	5.2
Bee	132,534	9,862	7.4
Bell	502,517	24,267	4.8
Bexar	139,047	12,603	9.3
Blanco	58,994	6,280	10.6
Borden	21,252	4,493	5.5
Busque	210,720	13,261	6.3
Bowie	256,761	20,954	8.2
Brazoria	113,893	14,681	12.9
Brazos	175,115	8,232	4.7
Brewster	126,552	3,689	2.9
Briscoe	148,212	8,869	5.9
Brooks	40,990	1,815	4.4
Brown	143,893	11,091	7.7
Burleson	240,187	19,124	8.0
Burnet	130,816	14,056	10.7
Caldwell	209,064	14,991	7.2
Calhoun	73,255	8,428	4.7
Callahan	119,660	9,916	8.3
Cameron	416,904	45,656	10.9
Camp	64,555	8,096	12.5
Carson	227,471	2,913	1.3
Cass	271,663	21,215	7.8
Castro	295,311	11,408	3.9
Chambers	25,175	5,608	22.3
Cherokee	251,429	44,056	17.5
Childress	219,878	12,107	5.5
Clay	236,851	12,799	5.8
Cochran	160,046	4,526	2.8
Coke	110,010	6,941	6.3
Coleman	299,284	19,100	6.4
Collin	603,406	25,454	4.2
Collingsworth	330,042	7,882	2.4
Colorado	160,991	14,185	8.8
Comal	60,642	4,624	7.6
Comanche	120,110	22,802	19.0
Concho	183,832	9,701	5.3
Cooke	233,946	22,822	9.7
Coryell	283,991	18,550	6.5
Cottle	200,129	9,378	4.7
Crane	8,174	489	6.0
Crockett	121,706	3,119	2.6
Crosby	390,862	13,806	3.5
Culberson	80,301	2,766	3.4
Dallam	279,371	8,559	3.0
Dallas	366,218	29,343	8.0
Dawson	498,743	14,453	2.9
Deaf Smith	351,427	7,775	2.2
Delta	217,485	10,484	4.8
Denton	352,842	20,846	5.9
De Witt	220,941	15,610	7.1
Dickens	220,945	8,428	3.8
Dimmit	100,278	4,955	4.9
Donley	208,907	11,851	5.7
Duval	127,598	6,565	5.1
Eastland	69,325	13,384	19.3
Ector	23,200	658	2.8
Edwards	113,159	3,536	3.1
Ellis	717,291	29,510	4.1
El Paso	327,570	11,538	3.5
Erath	157,067	21,457	13.7
Falls	446,862	22,848	5.1
Fannin	561,497	24,690	4.4
Fayette	288,586	22,750	8.5

Gross payments to farmers and County Agricultural Conservation Association expenses, 1940 conservation program—Continued

## TEXAS—continued

County	Gross payments	Association expense	Percent expense is of payments
Fisher	\$330,479	\$10,022	3.0
Floyd	357,663	13,374	3.7
Foard	140,995	6,678	4.7
Fort Bend	354,806	12,886	3.6
Franklin	84,088	8,020	9.5
Freestone	198,353	14,302	7.2
Frio	99,761	8,936	8.9
Gaines	92,958	6,137	6.6
Galveston	13,281	2,617	18.9
Garza	181,338	8,766	4.8
Gillespie	88,849	10,341	11.6
Glasscock	55,171	2,800	5.1
Goliad	98,786	7,930	8.0
Gonzales	251,334	13,071	5.2
Gray	180,991	4,109	2.3
Grayson	480,595	28,215	5.9
Gregg	52,876	6,691	11.3
Grimes	208,363	20,566	9.9
Guadalupe	244,906	18,523	5.5
Hale	474,265	13,097	2.8
Hall	320,072	9,731	3.0
Hamilton	196,296	13,867	7.1
Hansford	241,225	7,816	3.2
Hardeman	233,156	8,739	3.7
Hardin	4,854	2,865	59.0
Harris	114,504	16,944	14.8
Harrison	263,874	21,981	8.3
Hartley	178,374	4,714	2.6
Haskell	405,237	11,907	2.9
Hays	105,758	9,892	9.4
Hemphill	106,584	4,258	4.0
Henderson	245,827	23,518	9.6
Hidalgo	569,261	29,403	5.2
Hill	567,842	25,466	4.5
Hockley	449,267	16,107	3.6
Hood	57,456	11,340	19.7
Hopkins	328,566	21,477	6.5
Houston	297,399	29,383	9.9
Howard	222,889	7,745	3.5
Hudspeth	119,258	5,391	4.5
Hunt	564,271	27,515	4.9
Hutchinson	105,177	2,046	2.9
Irion	53,157	2,732	5.1
Jack	84,381	11,854	14.0
Jackson	163,789	8,070	4.9
Jasper	36,658	8,089	22.0
Jeff Davis	78,255	2,960	3.8
Jefferson	63,492	7,652	12.6
Jim Hogg	48,647	1,676	3.4
Jim Wells	165,754	6,915	4.2
Johnson	278,376	20,115	7.2
Jones	437,915	15,666	3.5
Karnes	275,722	16,955	6.1
Kaufman	412,416	22,735	5.5
Kendall	42,214	5,336	12.6
Kenedy	5,543	106	1.9
Kent	100,400	5,887	5.9
Kerr	65,833	4,497	6.8
Kimble	77,023	4,249	5.5
King	64,836	4,381	6.7
Kinney	56,192	2,442	4.3
Kleberg	88,280	2,319	3.4
Knox	265,463	9,211	3.5
Lamar	428,772	20,987	4.9
Lamb	658,217	12,873	1.9
Lampasas	93,251	6,479	6.9
La Salle	102,130	3,482	3.4
Leon	215,107	24,740	11.5
Lee	103,089	13,127	12.7
Liberty	178,772	15,721	8.8
Limestone	70,287	9,941	12.5
Lipscomb	442,414	26,678	4.7
Live Oak	164,616	4,882	3.0
Llano	164,593	8,146	4.9
Loving	60,272	4,571	7.6
Lubbock	14,493	678	4.7
Lynn	698,429	16,480	2.3
McCulloch	602,602	8,337	1.4
McCluskey	213,419	10,861	

Gross payments to farmers and County Agricultural Conservation Association expenses, 1940 conservation program—Continued

## TEXAS—continued

County	Gross payments	Association expense	Percent expense is of payments
Nueces.....	\$646,507	\$12,485	1.9
Ochiltree.....	274,069	2,073	.8
Oldham.....	106,946	4,527	4.2
Orange.....	8,510	4,600	54.0
Palo Pinto.....	202,175	8,539	9.9
Panola.....	109,616	21,230	10.5
Parker.....	260,033	27,983	25.5
Parmer.....	163,680	13,021	5.0
Pecos.....	82,323	5,096	3.1
Polk.....	84,939	12,231	14.8
Potter.....	98,670	3,391	4.0
Presidio.....	85,650	6,930	7.0
Rains.....	239,363	6,919	8.1
Randall.....	38,694	5,143	2.2
Reagan.....	38,215	1,611	4.2
Real.....	304,125	2,351	6.1
Red River.....	84,599	19,698	6.5
Reeves.....	104,899	4,704	5.5
Refugio.....	81,399	5,551	5.3
Roberts.....	285,765	1,911	2.3
Robertson.....	119,052	15,675	5.5
Rockwall.....	429,301	6,992	5.9
Runnels.....	241,399	26,295	6.1
Rush.....	55,269	30,499	12.6
Sabine.....	82,451	10,549	19.0
San Augustine.....	82,451	15,131	18.3
San Jacinto.....	134,718	7,111	11.5
San Patricio.....	383,108	10,927	2.8
San Saba.....	98,647	12,925	9.6
Schleicher.....	250,716	4,412	4.5
Scurry.....	56,621	9,023	3.5
Schackelford.....	210,942	4,764	7.2
Shelby.....	237,482	25,134	11.9
Sherman.....	297,489	5,170	2.2
Smith.....	24,339	23,607	7.9
Somervell.....	97,817	4,129	17.0
Starr.....	64,702	6,043	6.2
Stephens.....	49,240	7,168	11.1
Sterling.....	158,309	2,318	4.7
Sutton.....	76,923	7,628	4.8
Swisher.....	304,513	2,919	3.8
Tarrant.....	168,846	8,211	2.7
Taylor.....	272,772	16,249	9.6
Terrell.....	86,366	16,737	3.2
Terry.....	374,482	11,939	3.2
Throckmorton.....	82,407	5,301	6.4
Titus.....	118,582	11,939	10.3
Tom Green.....	241,673	12,150	4.2
Travis.....	250,585	20,236	8.5
Trinity.....	84,720	21,334	12.8
Tyler.....	31,917	8,892	21.1
Upshur.....	162,516	6,739	9.0
Upton.....	47,423	14,674	3.8
Uvalde.....	123,563	1,809	6.4
Val Verde.....	157,069	7,079	5.7
Van Zandt.....	157,069	4,620	2.9
Victoria.....	314,297	10,223	6.7
Walker.....	103,923	21,223	6.7
Waller.....	82,127	10,638	7.1
Ward.....	65,845	7,398	9.6
Washington.....	243,754	7,913	6.4
Webb.....	139,483	4,226	6.8
Wharton.....	402,193	16,549	2.7
Wheeler.....	277,060	3,734	7.3
Wichita.....	142,759	29,357	2.5
Wilbarger.....	313,569	9,858	2.5
Willacy.....	337,106	5,535	3.0
Williamson.....	584,925	9,758	2.9
Wilson.....	160,380	16,568	2.8
Winkler.....	160,380	12,260	7.6
Wise.....	16,909	1,201	7.1
Wood.....	168,748	16,554	9.8
Yoakum.....	174,463	16,062	9.2
Young.....	56,835	2,321	4.1
Zapata.....	160,256	11,240	7.0
Zavala.....	42,848	3,796	8.8
Zavala.....	73,900	3,962	5.4
Total or average.....	49,196,449	2,851,434	5.8

## UTAH

Beaver.....	\$9,911	\$1,815	18.3
Box Elder.....	171,024	5,681	3.3
Cache.....	82,793	6,914	8.3
Carbon.....	16,465	2,239	13.6
Daggett.....	2,829	577	20.4
Davis.....	16,105	3,213	19.9
Duchesne.....	49,102	5,163	10.4
Emery.....	24,346	3,962	16.3
Garfield.....	17,413	2,768	15.9
Grand.....	6,260	1,201	19.2
Iron.....	31,269	4,921	15.7
Juab.....	46,674	3,619	7.8
Kane.....	7,491	1,488	19.9
Millard.....	48,974	5,914	12.1
Morgan.....	12,173	1,165	9.6
Piute.....	6,872	1,796	26.1
Rice.....	24,350	2,147	8.8

Gross payments to farmers and County Agricultural Conservation Association expenses, 1940 conservation program—Continued

## UTAH—continued

County	Gross payments	Association expense	Percent expense is of payments
Salt Lake.....	\$37,317	\$5,560	14.9
San Juan.....	16,577	2,298	13.9
Sanpete.....	43,853	6,153	14.0
Sevier.....	22,138	3,178	14.4
Summit.....	19,102	2,866	15.0
Tooele.....	18,243	2,380	13.0
Uintah.....	24,193	4,066	16.8
Utah.....	74,876	12,858	17.2
Wasatch.....	17,992	2,260	12.6
Washington.....	18,894	3,802	20.1
Wayne.....	7,877	1,386	17.6
Weber.....	39,226	3,958	10.1
Total or average.....	514,339	105,288	11.5

## VERMONT

Addison.....	\$75,135	\$9,933	13.2
Bennington.....	28,227	3,381	12.0
Caledonia.....	71,064	6,954	9.8
Chittenden.....	67,886	7,331	10.8
Essex.....	22,637	3,014	13.3
Franklin.....	83,971	7,978	9.5
Grand Isle.....	14,043	1,991	14.2
Lamoille.....	47,119	5,163	10.9
Orange.....	65,376	8,208	12.2
Orleans.....	102,207	15,348	15.0
Rutland.....	74,035	8,151	11.0
Washington.....	75,796	8,929	11.8
Windham.....	43,263	5,454	12.6
Windsor.....	62,082	8,490	13.5
Total or average.....	833,441	100,325	12.0

## VIRGINIA

Accomac.....	\$131,606	\$13,670	10.4
Albemarle.....	50,690	6,512	12.8
Alleghany.....	10,110	1,565	15.5
Amelia.....	38,982	5,661	14.5
Amherst.....	30,236	4,596	15.2
Appomattox.....	36,944	5,627	15.2
Augusta.....	113,014	9,306	8.2
Bath.....	9,882	1,635	16.5
Bedford.....	54,829	10,178	18.6
Bland.....	18,990	1,963	10.3
Botetourt.....	25,875	4,225	16.3
Brunswick.....	107,684	11,768	10.9
Buchanan.....	11,950	2,868	24.0
Buckingham.....	31,085	7,510	24.2
Campbell.....	55,283	10,361	18.7
Caroline.....	29,502	4,527	15.3
Carroll.....	71,217	11,902	16.7
Charles City.....	8,007	1,511	18.9
Charlotte.....	73,102	11,041	15.1
Chesterfield.....	21,727	4,508	20.7
Clarke.....	24,950	1,438	5.8
Craig.....	11,465	855	7.5
Culpeper.....	39,169	12,152	31.0
Cumberland.....	27,982	5,894	21.1
Dickenson.....	7,781	3,968	51.0
Dinwiddie.....	59,736	7,002	11.7
Elizabeth City, York, and Warwick.....	13,284	2,836	21.3
Essex.....	25,174	3,184	12.6
Fairfax and Arlington.....	24,923	10,279	41.2
Fauquier.....	86,653	6,915	8.0
Floyd.....	35,999	8,620	23.9
Fluvanna.....	17,284	3,790	21.9
Franklin.....	66,434	17,596	26.5
Frederick.....	40,805	4,714	10.1
Giles.....	19,298	4,233	21.9
Gloucester.....	10,396	3,265	19.9
Gooseland.....	19,561	4,366	22.3
Grayson.....	46,827	5,970	12.7
Greene.....	12,660	1,477	11.7
Greensville.....	42,448	3,069	7.1
Halifax.....	186,960	22,975	12.3
Hanover.....	33,236	7,398	22.3
Henrico.....	12,867	2,222	17.3
Henry.....	22,197	6,371	28.7
Highland.....	15,623	1,762	11.3
Isle of Wight.....	28,117	2,821	10.0
James City.....	9,510	866	9.1
King.....	22,041	4,535	20.6
King and Queen.....	12,682	2,274	17.9
King George.....	18,115	2,937	16.2
King William.....	7,334	2,026	27.6
Lancaster.....	50,606	9,169	18.0
Loudoun.....	74,814	6,012	13.3
Louisa.....	23,736	3,146	13.3
Lunenburg.....	81,808	12,663	15.5
Madison.....	28,476	3,596	12.6
Mathews.....	9,723	3,014	31.0
Mecklenburg.....	174,585	24,606	14.1

Gross payments to farmers and County Agricultural Conservation Association expenses, 1940 conservation program—Continued

## VIRGINIA—continued

County	Gross payments	Association expense	Percent expense is of payments
Middlesex.....	\$111,750	\$2,304	19.6
Montgomery.....	28,500	4,638	16.3
Nansemond.....	56,602	5,712	10.1
Nelson.....	36,515	4,255	11.7
New Kent.....	6,154	1,481	24.1
Norfolk.....	31,935	2,631	8.3
Northampton.....	92,140	5,350	5.8
Northumberland.....	17,245	4,045	23.5
Nottoway.....	42,367	6,517	15.4
Orange.....	28,860	2,415	8.4
Page.....	32,143	2,566	8.0
Patrick.....	47,062	17,091	36.3
Pittsylvania.....	216,361	29,184	13.5
Powhatan.....	13,404	2,367	17.7
Prince Edward.....	45,682	7,603	16.6
Prince George.....	28,786	3,631	12.6
Prince William.....	32,340	17,826	55.1
Princess Anne.....	47,969	4,197	8.7
Pulaski.....	36,362	4,659	12.8
Rappahannock.....	36,445	6,171	16.9
Richmond.....	17,613	2,615	14.3
Roanoke.....	31,314	3,876	12.4
Rockbridge.....	37,612	2,882	7.7
Rockingham.....	83,146	7,655	9.2
Russell.....	78,518	13,011	16.6
Scott.....	58,130	12,247	21.1
Shenandoah.....	53,837	4,998	9.3
Smyth.....	41,547	5,606	13.5
Southampton.....	80,508	9,291	11.6
Spotsylvania.....	19,112	2,878	15.1
Stafford.....	12,818	2,320	18.1
Surry.....	19,733	1,584	8.0
Sussex.....	33,860	6,056	17.9
Tazewell.....	39,392	7,108	18.0
Warren.....	17,699	1,924	10.9
Washington.....	88,254	14,622	16.6
Westmoreland.....	24,137	3,492	14.5
Wise.....	15,121	3,447	22.8
Wythe.....	45,115	13,259	29.4
Total or average.....	4,082,862	614,407	15.1

## WASHINGTON

Adams.....	\$100,333	\$5,425	2.8
Asotin.....	53,024	1,534	3.6
Benton.....	51,311	9,163	17.9
Chelan.....	31,602	6,130	19.4
Clallam.....	16,265	3,431	21.1
Clark.....	54,153	11,259	20.8
Columbia.....	148,394	4,535	3.1
Cowlitz.....	18,109	4,376	24.2
Douglas.....	74,498	8,672	11.6
Ferry.....	14,302	3,435	24.0
Franklin.....	122,170	5,382	4.4
Garfield.....	103,504	3,413	3.3
Grant.....	80,366	7,060	8.8
Grays Harbor.....	14,680	4,170	28.4
Island.....	16,245	2,304	14.2
Jefferson.....	5,524	1,630	29.5
King.....	31,562	9,147	29.0
Kitsap.....	5,542	1,325	23.9
Kittitas.....	58,225	7,237	7.4
Klickitat.....	80,130	5,801	7.2
Lewis.....	42,205	11,094	26.3
Lincoln.....	194,808	9,955	5.1
Mason.....	5,902	1,021	17.3
Okanogan.....	106,069	14,444	13.6
Pacific.....	10,426	1,200	11.5
Pend Oreille.....	11,233	3,393	30.2
Pierce.....	21,912	5,639	25.7
San Juan.....	7,445	2,051	27.5
Skagit.....	38,981	8,911	22.9
Skamania.....	4,539	2,171	47.8
Snohomish.....	31,482	5,555	17.6
Spokane.....	246,187	11,513	4.7
Stevens.....	89,006	8,522	9.6
Thurston.....	23,693	6,590	27.8
Wahkiakum.....	8,057	2,678	33.2
Walla Walla.....	308,949	6,794	2.2
Whatcom.....	56,829	11,631	20.5
Whitman.....	583,936	13,854	2.4
Yakima.....	249,566	29,877	12.0
Total or average.....	3,251,164	262,752	8.1

## WEST VIRGINIA

Barbour.....	\$27,064	\$5,535	20.4
Berkeley.....	43,379	3,414	7.9
Boone and Logan.....	20,558	4,981	24.2
Braxton.....	46,953	8,280	17.6
Brooke.....	30,468	1,402	23.2
Cabell.....	30,869	6,702	28.3
Calhoun.....	26,671	7,283	27.3
Clay.....	15,056	3,067	20.4
Doddridge.....	29,036	3,971	13.7



Gross payments to farmers and County Agricultural Conservation Association expenses, 1940 conservation program—Continued

WEST VIRGINIA—continued

County	Gross payments	Association expense	Percent expense is of payments
Fayette	\$24,363	\$7,134	29.3
Gilmer	23,457	5,837	24.9
Grant	21,900	8,177	14.5
Greenbrier	48,654	5,573	11.4
Hampshire	36,516	4,071	11.1
Hancock	5,832	1,154	19.8
Hardy	25,241	3,795	15.0
Harrison	67,837	7,223	10.6
Jackson	41,673	8,128	19.5
Jefferson	54,660	2,698	4.9
Kanawha	20,439	7,284	35.6
Lewis	45,182	8,203	18.1
Lincoln	31,209	9,317	29.8
Marion	29,980	6,056	20.2
Marshall	26,305	5,022	19.1
Mason	35,682	7,769	21.8
Mercer, McDowell, and Wyoming	33,918	7,643	22.5
Mineral	19,520	2,417	12.4
Mingo and Wayne	28,589	7,279	25.5
Monongalia	21,904	4,629	21.1
Monroe	37,375	5,280	14.1
Morgan	12,235	1,653	13.5
Nicholas	28,775	5,698	19.8
Ohio	7,605	1,705	24.3
Pendleton	33,571	4,497	13.4
Pleasants	13,637	1,988	14.6
Pocahontas	33,509	4,910	14.5
Preston	40,428	7,077	17.5
Putnam	21,257	8,742	41.1
Raleigh	50,711	11,272	22.2
Randolph	32,204	5,124	15.9
Ritchie	39,560	6,977	17.5
Roane	52,923	7,535	14.2
Summers	24,740	5,954	24.1
Taylor	14,150	4,151	29.3
Tucker	15,890	2,014	12.7
Tyler	24,644	4,283	17.4
Upshur	46,032	8,335	18.1
Webster	18,251	3,678	20.1
Wetzel	25,978	7,508	28.9
Wirt	18,535	4,546	24.5
Wood	29,187	5,876	20.1
Total or average	1,509,790	279,871	18.5

WISCONSIN

Adams	\$75,526	\$7,702	10.2
Ashland	30,859	6,202	2.0
Barron	255,263	22,622	8.9
Bayfield	39,982	7,631	19.8
Brown	177,621	15,086	8.5
Buffalo	175,673	12,070	6.9
Burnett	118,308	10,334	8.7
Calumet	133,201	8,093	6.1
Chippewa	246,096	20,569	8.4
Clark	259,059	21,553	8.3
Columbia	352,274	12,220	3.7
Crawford	138,012	7,558	5.8
Dane	620,649	24,372	3.9
Dodge	303,254	22,143	7.3
Door	109,015	11,583	11.0
Douglas	57,924	7,433	12.8
Dunn	274,420	16,202	5.9
Eau Claire	170,625	12,812	7.2
Florence and Forest	29,629	7,046	23.8
Fond du Lac	268,062	17,192	6.7
Grant	455,161	13,285	2.9
Green	244,867	7,634	3.2
Green Lake	113,839	6,203	5.5
Iowa	244,512	9,565	3.9
Iron	6,715	2,117	31.5
Jackson	155,302	12,884	8.3
Jefferson	214,581	10,644	5.0
Juneau	131,245	11,804	9.0
Kenosha	57,973	6,369	11.0
Kewaunee	102,039	8,278	8.1
La Crosse	118,630	7,582	6.4
Lafayette	299,443	9,540	3.2
Langlade	83,770	9,560	11.4
Lincoln	63,408	7,688	12.1
Manitowish	209,085	11,588	5.5
Marathon	365,268	31,141	8.5
Marinette	104,012	14,548	14.0
Marquette	90,865	5,956	6.6
Milwaukee	44,676	7,277	16.2
Monroe	197,485	17,948	9.1
Oconto	141,521	15,874	11.2
Oneida	23,669	4,779	19.9
Outagamie	207,209	17,274	8.3
Ozaukee	80,265	7,107	8.8
Pepin	68,396	4,416	6.5
Pierce	190,744	15,430	7.9
Polk	201,812	18,776	9.3
Portage	228,276	15,420	6.8
Price	53,527	9,683	18.1
Racine	76,323	7,635	10.0
Richland	126,471	9,464	7.5
Rock	457,469	14,026	3.2
Rusk	77,788	13,004	16.7

Gross payments to farmers and County Agricultural Conservation Association expenses, 1940 conservation program—Continued

WISCONSIN—continued

County	Gross payments	Association expense	Percent expense is of payments
St. Croix	\$274,387	\$15,803	5.8
Sauk	304,228	13,408	4.4
Sawyer	22,651	5,180	22.9
Shawano	208,507	15,777	7.6
Sheboygan	183,445	13,601	7.4
Taylor	105,642	13,621	12.9
Trempealeau	224,697	13,269	5.9
Vernon	238,044	19,184	8.1
Vilas	6,018	1,626	27.0
Walworth	289,059	11,699	4.0
Washington	45,129	7,766	17.2
Waukesha	161,430	13,010	8.1
Waukegan	179,685	11,418	6.4
Waukegan	230,625	15,040	6.5
Waukegan	159,772	11,569	7.3
Winnebago	125,236	11,771	9.4
Wood	143,003	11,739	8.2
Total or average	11,950,686	842,033	7.0

WYOMING

Albany	\$78,920	\$4,221	5.3
Big Horn	45,924	10,266	22.4
Campbell	185,172	21,179	11.4
Carbon	121,399	14,563	12.0
Converse	148,602	13,864	9.3
Crook	114,450	12,085	10.6
Fremont	69,016	13,376	19.4
Goshen	207,665	16,965	8.2
Hot Springs	25,721	4,025	15.6
Johnson	90,613	8,314	9.2
Laramie	151,402	15,155	10.0
Lincoln	59,074	12,317	20.9
Natrona	94,798	10,675	10.6
Niobrara	85,231	7,627	8.9
Park	65,775	12,230	18.6
Platte	145,280	12,843	8.8
Sheridan	94,182	14,294	15.2
Sublette	59,352	7,425	12.5
Sweetwater	24,993	5,404	21.6
Teton	8,751	3,613	41.3
Uinta	40,195	5,764	14.3
Washakie	20,591	2,845	13.8
Weston	88,521	9,832	11.1
Total or average	2,025,267	238,282	11.8

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Conservation and Use of Agricultural Land Resources, Department of Agriculture," on page 75, line 17, after the word "thereof," to insert a colon and the following additional proviso: "Provided further, That no payment or payments shall be made from funds appropriated hereunder, for seed delivered to agricultural producers except as provided for in Public Law 121, Seventy-seventh Congress, first session, on purchase orders to regularly established jobbers and dealers or to farmer-owned and farmer-controlled cooperative associations for a reasonable and fair compensation except in areas where such services are not available or for the distributing of such seed used in an introductory or experimental way," and on page 76, line 13, after the word "Government," to strike out the colon and the following additional proviso: "Provided further, That no payment or payments hereunder, to any one person or corporation shall be in excess of the total sum of \$1,000, but in applying this limitation there shall be excluded amounts representing a landlord's share of a payment made with respect to land operated under a tenancy or sharecropper relationship if the division of the payment between the landlord and tenant

or sharecropper is determined by the local committee to be in accordance with fair and customary standards of renting and sharecropping prevailing in the locality. In the case of payments to any person on account of performance on farms in different States, Territories, or possessions the limitation shall be applied to the total of the payments for each State, Territory, or possession for a year, and not to the total of all payments."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Parity payments," on page 78, line 22, after the numerals "1942", to insert: "and the applicable rate of the payments under the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, for the purposes of the 1942 agricultural conservation program."

The amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the agreement, the amendment on page 80 will be passed over.

Mr. RUSSELL. That amendment is to go over, by agreement.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I should like to have the Senator from Georgia explain the amendment at the bottom of page 75. Was that the one offered by the Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS]?

Mr. RUSSELL. That is the amendment which relates to the method of distributing seed.

Mr. HUGHES. I ask for an explanation of the amendment at the bottom of page 76.

Mr. RUSSELL. An amendment was offered on the floor of the House which undertook, in about seven or eight lines, to rewrite and change all the laws relating to the Agricultural Adjustment Administration, and the method of handling those laws. There is a statute at the present time which provides a limit of \$10,000 on the amount which can be paid any one producer. The amendment offered on the floor of the House undertook to change that provision, to limit it to \$1,000, unless, according to some formula which is very difficult to understand, the farmer might have done certain things.

The Committee on Appropriations is always very loath to legislate, and if we had undertaken to revise all the laws relating to payments under the Agricultural Adjustment Act and had been fair to all parties, we would have been compelled to hold hearings extending at least over 3 months. We did not have the time to do that, and we were not the committee to do it. The standing committee on Agriculture and Forestry would be the proper committee to handle the subject. So we struck the provision out. I do not think it has any place in an appropriation bill, and it was adopted in the House after a very brief discussion.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations to be considered.

Mr. RUSSELL. All the items relating to the Farm Security Administration were to go over, under the agreement.

Mr. BYRD. Beginning with the item of "Farm Tenancy," on page 83.

Mr. RUSSELL. The items in the bill between pages 83 to 88 have gone over.

Mr. BYRD. It is understood, I think, that they will be considered Monday.

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes. I do not think we can consider them this afternoon. I had been hopeful we could conclude their consideration today, but if it meets the convenience of the Senator from Virginia, they may go over until Monday.

Mr. BYRD. Not only the Senator from Virginia but many other Senators will be away tomorrow.

Mr. RUSSELL. No Senator except the Senator from Virginia has mentioned it to me.

Mr. BYRD. But others have mentioned it to me, and they desire to be present when the matter is discussed.

Mr. RUSSELL. The next amendment to be considered under the agreement, as I understand, is to be found on page 90, line 21.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. Under the heading "Rural Electrification Administration", on page 90, line 21, after the word "reports", it is proposed to strike out "\$3,750,000" and insert "\$3,500,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 91, at the end of line 15, to reduce the total appropriation for the Rural Electrification Administration from \$3,750,000 to \$3,500,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Interchange of appropriations," on page 92, line 9, after the word "exceed", to strike out "5" and insert "10"; and in line 14, after the word "than", to strike out "5" and insert "10."

Mr. BYRD. Will not the Senator from Georgia give an explanation of the amendment?

Mr. RUSSELL. I shall be glad to undertake to do so. For some 20 years this item appeared in the bill with a limitation of 10 percent on the amounts to be exchanged between the several Budget estimates within a bureau. Last year the figure was reduced to 5 percent. This year, some of the bureaus which have very small appropriations thought it was necessary to have a little more elasticity in this item, in order to permit them to do some work that is important, due to shortages caused by the war. For example, in the Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine, under which there are no very large appropriations, requests have been made that the Bureau develop certain drugs of which there has been a shortage in this country. It cannot involve any very large amount of money. The 10-percent provision refers to what is done within any bureau. It does not mean 10 percent can be transferred from one bureau or subdivision in the Department to another, but merely that within a bureau a transfer can be made from one item to another of as much as 10 percent, to enable them to meet conditions which are changing very rapidly every day. I may say that this language has been in the bill for some 12 or 15 years. I have inquired into it for some years myself, and I have found it has never been abused in the 9

years or so I have been on the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. BYRD. Was the reduction to 5 percent made in the House?

Mr. RUSSELL. The reduction was made in the House. It was made last year for the first time.

Mr. BYRD. Has the 5 percent been in effect for a year?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes; the 5 percent has been in effect for 1 year.

Mr. BYRD. Has it worked any hardship?

Mr. RUSSELL. It had not until this year. It had not worked any hardship, but it was anticipated that it might. The Department has suggested that we set up an emergency fund of \$50,000 or \$100,000 to enable them to deal with new matters which have just come up. I did not like to increase the appropriation; I thought it would be better to give them a little more leeway in transferring the funds within the several bureaus than to make an increased appropriation.

Mr. BYRD. Which means then that after the Congress has appropriated money for specific purposes, it can be transferred within a particular department, to the extent of 10 percent?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes; within a particular bureau; that is correct.

Mr. BYRD. I wonder if the Senator would not let that matter go over until tomorrow?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, of course, if the Senator from Virginia objects to it, we shall have to let it go over until tomorrow.

Mr. BYRD. I think to that extent Congress will lose control over the appropriation.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is true to a certain extent. Of course, the control of the Congress over the various 1,800 activities of the Department is fixed by the Budget estimates which are sent up by the Bureau of the Budget, because the bill does not contain a break-down of how all these funds should be spent within a bureau. That is fixed by the Budget estimate. This language does not change anything the Congress has done, except insofar as we approve of the estimates which have been sent in to the Congress by the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. BYRD. I talked to the Senator from Georgia earlier in the day about the travel expenses, and he said the Budget estimates controlled the amount of the travel expenses. This provision would certainly prevent that control to the extent of 10 percent.

Mr. RUSSELL. It would as between the several bureaus; yes.

Mr. BYRD. I think if the Senator does not mind we had better let the matter go over until tomorrow.

Mr. RUSSELL. I suggest to the Senator from Kentucky then that the Senate take a recess at this time until tomorrow.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. President, there is another provision in the bill dealing with the travel expenses. It is found on page 102. I wonder whether that has something to do with limitation on travel expenses.

Mr. RUSSELL. The item on page 102 reduces travel expenses by \$1,500,000.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Georgia whether he wants the Senate to meet tomorrow or to go over until Monday.

Mr. RUSSELL. In view of the objections which have been raised, I think we had better recess until tomorrow, and conclude consideration of the bill then.

Mr. BARKLEY. I wish to state that ordinarily when a bill is under consideration I would move that the Senate take a recess until the next day, but, under the rule, a vote cannot be had upon the Downey resolution if the Senate takes a recess, whereas if the Senate adjourns the resolution comes up automatically; and since it is practically the unanimous desire of the Senate that we have a vote on the resolution, I shall move that the Senate adjourn, instead of taking a recess, but shall not do so at this moment.

I wish to say that when we conclude the business of today I shall move to adjourn. That will give us a morning hour tomorrow, and during the morning hour the Downey resolution comes automatically before the Senate without any motion, and I hope we can vote on it tomorrow. It was the desire of practically every Senator to vote on the motion today. The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] exercised his right in objecting to it being considered. I have great respect, of course, for the Senator from Nebraska, and I do not question his motives in any way, but it is regrettable that we could not have voted on the resolution today. I hope it will come to a vote tomorrow.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the Senator from Virginia today inquired as to the amount that had been transferred to the Bureau of Agricultural Economics from other departments. I submitted an inquiry to the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, and I am advised that in March 1942, \$25,651.58 was transferred from the Lease-Lend Administrator to enable the Bureau of Agricultural Economics to conduct special surveys for the Lease-Lend Administration of the production and capacity of milk-processing plants, canning plants, and preserving plants, as well as a survey of sources of vegetable seed and special stocks, and other production surveys.

In addition to that the Office of Facts and Figures has transferred to the Bureau of Agricultural Economics the sum of \$117,864.67 so far this year, and it is proposed to transfer another \$121,000, making a total of \$239,000.

These transfers were made because the Office of Facts and Figures requested the Department of Agriculture to make field surveys for it. The Bureau of Agricultural Economics already had a staff trained in this work, and it was considered that it could do the work much more economically than could the Office of Facts and Figures, had they undertaken to set up an entirely new organization. So far as I am advised, that is the total amount of funds which have been transferred from other agencies.

#### SUNDRY MATTERS AFFECTING THE MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagree-



ment to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4476) providing for sundry matters affecting the Military Establishment, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Vice President appointed Mr. REYNOLDS, Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, Mr. LEE, Mr. AUSTIN, and Mr. GURNEY conferees on the part of the Senate.

#### DEBT AND TAXES

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD an editorial appearing in the New York Times today entitled "Debt and Taxes." The editorial is worth reading by every Member of the Senate. It calls attention to a vital omission in our present income-tax law. I say vital omission because, with rapidly rising tax rates, with exceedingly high tax rates, provision must be made for deductions from the gross income of taxpayers to meet debts contracted prior to this period. The editorial calls attention to that matter.

I am pleased to say that repeated conference with the Treasury leads me to believe that the Secretary of the Treasury will recommend to the Ways and Means Committee of the House the inclusion of some suitable provision allowing deductions of payments made on existing debts. Under the present law, deductions are permissible only for interest paid upon debts, and not upon any amortization of the debts. That has been bearable so long as the general level of income taxes has remained reasonably low, but as that level advances, the debtor taxpayer is simply unable to liquidate his debt unless some deduction is allowed for payments upon existing debts.

I wish to take this occasion to say that the ability of the taxpayer to liquidate his debt, whether it be an individual or corporation, determines the capacity of the taxpayer to borrow. In other words, it goes to the basis of the whole credit system, and the credit system is the basis of the free enterprise system as we know it in the United States.

I should like to say at this point also that the whole American industrial machine is now undergoing depreciation and obsolescence at a rate more rapid than ever before in the history of American industry, perhaps in the history of industry in the world. It therefore is doubly necessary not only that provision be made for payments upon existing debts against the taxable income of taxpayers, but it is likewise necessary that additional provision be made for reserves, in order that there may be some possible cushion after the war is over, when the whole industrial machine will have become more depreciated and will have become obsolescent in a degree higher than ever before in the history of American industry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Georgia?

There being no objection; the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### DEBT AND TAXES

None of us is wise enough to know exactly what problems we shall face when the need for war production ends. But it is certain that whether we face contraction or expansion, we shall meet the test more successfully if we have utilized a portion of our wartime income to reduce private debt.

There are two aspects to this question. One is the factor of the future financial strength of our economy. The burden of debt under which the railroads of the country labored in the nineteen thirties was a brake upon all industry and all finance. If there is one lesson that we should have learned from that experience it is that a period of increased income should be utilized to get out of debt in order that a depression period may find us stronger. The other factor is the general problem of inflation. Essentially, the danger of inflation arises from the fact that Government is greatly expanding its debt, particularly its borrowing from commercial banks. To the extent that the proceeds of this expanding Government credit, flowing out in payment for war orders and expanding the national income, is used to repay private debt, the total potential of inflation is checked. This applies particularly to the reduction of bank debt, but in the long run all debt reduction tends to be counter-inflationary.

The President recognized this in the seventh point of his anti-inflation program, which called for encouraging the paying off of debts. But as yet nothing effective has been done to carry this policy into action. On the contrary, our tax laws work in the opposite direction. They encourage debt by permitting the deduction of interest payments from taxable income, but afford no relief to the debtor who seeks to repay principal. This condition becomes of increasing importance as the tax rates are lifted.

The House Ways and Means Committee, which has repeatedly given proof of its understanding of this type of problem, might well consider a provision in the 1942 tax bill to carry out the President's recommendation for encouraging the repayment of debt. The precise method can best be determined by the committee; but the net effect should be to exempt from taxation some part of current income, provided it is employed in reducing debt. Such a provision would not merely fit the requirements of wartime taxation but would be an important practical contribution to post-war planning.

#### POSTMASTER

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, there is only one nomination on the Executive Calendar, and I ask unanimous consent, as in executive session, that the nomination of Glennie Flatthers Whites to be postmaster at Iroquois, S. Dak., be confirmed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

#### EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The VICE PRESIDENT, as in executive session, laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 18 minutes p. m.), the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, May 15, 1942, at 12 o'clock noon.

#### NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate May 14, 1942:

##### DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The following-named persons now Foreign Service officers of class 7 and secretaries in the Diplomatic Service, to be also consuls of the United States of America:

Frederick E. Farnsworth, of Colorado.  
F. Ridgway Lineaweaver, of Pennsylvania.

##### UNITED STATES MARSHAL

Spencer C. Young, of New York, to be United States marshal for the eastern district of New York, vice Arthur G. Jaeger, term expired.

##### REGISTER OF THE LAND OFFICE

Paul A. Roach, of New Mexico, to be register of the land office at Las Cruces, N. Mex. Reappointment.

##### UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The following-named senior sanitary engineer to be a sanitary engineer director in the United States Public Health Service, to rank as such from the date set opposite his name:

Ralph E. Tarbett, July 23, 1942.

##### APPOINTMENTS FOR TEMPORARY SERVICE IN THE NAVY

Capt. Robert H. English to be a rear admiral in the Navy for temporary service, to rank from the 8th day of May 1942.

Capt. Donald B. Beary to be a rear admiral in the Navy for temporary service, to rank from the 1st day of December 1941.

##### APPOINTMENTS AND PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY

Capt. James L. Kauffman to be a rear admiral in the Navy, to rank from the 1st day of January 1942.

The following-named lieutenant commanders to be commanders in the Navy, to rank from the 1st day of January 1942:

Clarence E. Voegell	Melville E. Eaton
Harvey T. Walsh	Leo B. Farrell
Kenneth L. Forster	Edwin A. Taylor
John J. Curley, Jr.	Lucien Ragonnet
Joseph C. Hubbard	Donald S. Evans
John G. Winn	Frank T. Watkins

The following-named lieutenants to be lieutenant commanders in the Navy, to rank from the date stated opposite their names:

William H. Ashford, Jr., December 16, 1941.
Milton A. Nation, January 1, 1942.
Robert V. Hull, January 1, 1942.
Carl L. Steiner, January 1, 1942.
William Loveland, January 1, 1942.
Clinton S. Rounds, January 1, 1942.
Clarence E. Duke, January 1, 1942.
John E. Clark, January 1, 1942.
William A. Sutherland, Jr., January 1, 1942.
Francis R. Jones, January 1, 1942.
David W. Shafer, January 1, 1942.
Patrick Henry, January 1, 1942.
Gordon L. Caswell, January 1, 1942.
William W. Outerbridge, January 1, 1942.
Oscar H. Dodson, January 1, 1942.
John T. Brown, Jr., January 1, 1942.
James P. Walker, January 1, 1942.
Richard E. Myers, January 1, 1942.
Wilton S. Heald, January 1, 1942.
Calvin E. Wakeman, January 1, 1942.
George W. Wilcox, January 1, 1942.
Joseph D. McKinney, January 1, 1942.
Joseph R. Rubins, January 1, 1942.
William S. Maxwell, January 1, 1942.

The following-named lieutenants (junior grade) to be lieutenants in the Navy, to rank from the date stated opposite their names:

John S. Lehman, December 13, 1940.
Marion H. Eppes, November 1, 1941.
Clifford S. Foster, Jr., December 16, 1941.
Bruce P. Ross, January 1, 1942.

Frederick N. Phillips, Jr., January 1, 1942.  
Frederick J. Harflinger 2d, January 1, 1942.  
Frederick M. Stiesberg, January 1, 1942.

The following-named ensigns to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the Navy, to rank from the 2d day of June 1941:

James S. Cooley  
John C. Eckhardt, Jr.  
William J. Bush

Medical Inspector John L. Frazer, Jr., to be a medical director in the Navy, with the rank of captain, to rank from the 1st day of July 1941.

Surgeon Harry D. Templeton to be a medical inspector in the Navy, with the rank of commander, to rank from the 1st day of January 1942.

Passed Assistant Surgeon James J. V. Camisa to be a surgeon in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant commander, to rank from the 1st day of July 1941.

Assistant Surgeon George J. Kohut to be a passed assistant surgeon in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant, to rank from the 1st day of August 1941.

Paymaster George W. Bauernschmidt to be a pay inspector in the Navy, with the rank of commander, to rank from the 1st day of January 1942.

The following-named assistant paymasters to be passed assistant paymasters in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant, to rank from the date stated opposite their names:

John R. Lewis, September 1, 1941.  
Richard B. Winfield, January 1, 1942.  
Henry L. Muller, January 1, 1942.

Gunner Robert R. Snyder to be a chief gunner in the Navy, to rank with but after ensign, from the 1st day of February 1942.

Machinist Charles F. Vance to be a chief machinist in the Navy, to rank with but after ensign, from the 1st day of February 1942.

The following-named rear admirals to be rear admirals in the Navy, to rank from the date stated opposite their names to correct the date of rank as previously nominated and confirmed:

William R. Munroe, December 8, 1941.  
John F. Shafroth, Jr., January 1, 1942.

The following-named assistant surgeons to be assistant surgeons in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade), to rank from the date stated opposite their names to correct the date of rank as previously nominated and confirmed:

John J. Cunningham, May 1, 1940.  
Robert F. Robertson, February 17, 1941.  
John C. Hart, February 17, 1941.  
John W. Albrittain, February 17, 1941.  
John P. Dobson, February 17, 1941.  
Curtis H. Carter, February 17, 1941.  
Rodney R. Gleysteen, February 17, 1941.  
Marion L. Connerley, February 17, 1941.  
John S. Cowan, February 17, 1941.  
Walter M. Weber, February 17, 1941.  
Robert Z. Collings, Jr., May 26, 1941.  
Hunt B. Jones, May 26, 1941.  
Robert A. Freyling, May 26, 1941.  
Victor C. Stratton, May 26, 1941.  
John R. Gateley, May 26, 1941.  
William D. Yavorsky, May 26, 1941.  
Ronald N. Shelley, May 26, 1941.  
Lawrence C. Day, May 26, 1941.  
Charles Shafroff, May 26, 1941.  
William S. Baker, Jr., May 26, 1941.  
Wallace L. Chesbro, May 26, 1941.  
John B. Toepfer, Jr., May 26, 1941.  
Alfred G. Sherman, May 26, 1941.  
Raymond F. Higgins, May 26, 1941.  
Harold A. Smedal, May 26, 1941.  
Henry C. Hunley, Jr., May 26, 1941.

The following-named assistant dental surgeons to be assistant dental surgeons in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade), to rank from the date stated opposite their names to correct the date of rank as previously nominated and confirmed:

George C. Rader, February 17, 1941.  
Samstone Holmes, February 17, 1941.  
William E. Ludwick, February 17, 1941.

Irvin M. Blue, February 17, 1941.  
Earl A. Goldsmith, February 17, 1941.  
Charles H. Bercler, February 17, 1941.  
John N. Boege, February 17, 1941.  
Morgan F. McAfee, Jr., May 21, 1941.  
John P. Arthur, May 21, 1941.  
Angus W. Grant, May 21, 1941.  
Edward J. Sullivan, May 21, 1941.  
Daniel E. LaMothe, May 21, 1941.  
Carl W. Rasmussen, May 21, 1941.  
Vernon L. Anderson, May 21, 1941.  
Harold G. Green, May 21, 1941.  
William R. Curry, Jr., May 21, 1941.  
William A. McLennan, May 21, 1941.  
Charles E. Meyers, May 21, 1941.  
William M. Thomas, May 21, 1941.  
Albert B. Larson, May 21, 1941.  
Baker M. Hamilton, May 21, 1941.

The following-named assistant paymasters to be assistant paymasters in the Navy, with the rank of ensign, to rank from the 5th day of November, 1940, to correct the date of rank as previously nominated and confirmed:

Francis M. Fahy Daniel R. McComish  
Douglas C. Skafie Shelby C. Leasure, Jr.  
Albert B. Johnson Philip W. Evans  
Leonard F. Burrage 3d William M. Sander  
Fred Coleman

The following-named assistant civil engineers to be assistant civil engineers in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade), to rank from the date stated opposite their names to correct the date of rank as previously nominated and confirmed:

Raymond B. Krum, December 4, 1939.  
John W. Gordanier, December 4, 1939.  
Richard E. Harris, December 4, 1939.  
Charles G. Prahl, December 14, 1940.  
James A. Fitzgerald, December 14, 1940.  
Joseph C. Luppens, December 14, 1940.  
William J. Thompson, December 14, 1940.  
Joseph B. Barnwell, May 17, 1941.  
James S. Marsh, May 17, 1941.

The following to be assistant surgeons in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade), to rank from the date stated opposite their names:

Harry J. Alvis, February 17, 1941.  
Harold W. Fleischer, February 17, 1941.  
Frank S. Ashburn, January 25, 1942.  
Edward T. Haslam, January 25, 1942.  
Robert C. Abrams, January 25, 1942.  
Nelse O. Olson, January 25, 1942.  
Robert H. Leeds, January 25, 1942.  
Joseph G. McWilliams, January 25, 1942.  
George Jacobson, January 25, 1942.  
Sidney L. Arje, January 25, 1942.  
Harry C. Helm, January 25, 1942.  
George F. Fraser, January 25, 1942.  
Sam R. Burnett, May 5, 1942.  
Eugene P. Cronkite, May 5, 1942.  
James R. Dillon, Jr., May 5, 1942.  
John F. Merritt, May 5, 1942.  
Frank T. Sheehan, May 5, 1942.  
Rieber C. Hovde, May 5, 1942.  
Bassel N. Blanton, May 5, 1942.  
Benjamin F. Lee, Jr., May 5, 1942.  
Paul V. Breitenberger, May 5, 1942.  
Thomas S. Barnes, May 5, 1942.  
John W. Mills, May 5, 1942.  
Maurice A. Canon, May 5, 1942.  
Clifford N. Crawford, July 1, 1942.  
John W. Lyons, Jr., July 1, 1942.  
James H. Trolinger, July 1, 1942.  
Richard H. Williamson, July 1, 1942.  
Samuel J. Garfield, July 1, 1942.  
Charles H. Klammer, July 1, 1942.  
Robert W. Kullberg, July 1, 1942.  
Roderick L. Tondreau, July 1, 1942.  
Frederick W. Rayburn, July 1, 1942.  
Myron H. Nourse, July 1, 1942.  
Watson B. Larkin, July 1, 1942.  
James L. Richardson, July 1, 1942.  
Bronislav M. Lazich, July 1, 1942.  
Clyde L. Boice, July 1, 1942.  
Richard C. Morrison, July 1, 1942.  
George N. Ketcham, July 1, 1942.  
Philip J. Byrne, July 1, 1942.

The following to be assistant dental surgeons in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade), to rank from the date stated opposite their names:

Joseph A. Thimes, May 21, 1941.  
Nicholas E. Homichko, May 21, 1941.  
Walter J. Demer, January 12, 1942.  
Arthur S. Turville, January 12, 1942.  
Roger G. Gerry, January 12, 1942.  
Robert B. Wolcott, January 12, 1942.  
Paul W. Suito, January 12, 1942.  
Frederick S. Brown, Jr., January 12, 1942.  
Milton H. Brown, January 12, 1942.  
Clarence H. Blackstone, January 12, 1942.  
William P. Thomas, January 12, 1942.  
Elmer F. Morton, January 12, 1942.  
William J. Manion, January 12, 1942.  
Ramon J. Wallenborn, January 12, 1942.  
Guy Hughes, January 12, 1942.  
William D. King, January 12, 1942.  
Patrick G. Cronin, January 12, 1942.  
Edmund B. Carleton, January 12, 1942.  
Sidney R. Howell, January 12, 1942.  
William E. Dennard, January 12, 1942.  
Felix H. Norton, January 12, 1942.  
Charles M. Heck, January 12, 1942.  
John H. Atkins, January 12, 1942.  
Robert H. Loving, January 12, 1942.  
Joseph F. Link, January 12, 1942.  
Lee E. Krieger, January 12, 1942.  
Alexander D. Bunn, January 12, 1942.  
John E. Dwyer, January 12, 1942.  
Robert I. Phillips, January 12, 1942.  
Arne G. Nielsen, January 12, 1942.  
Gilbert F. Gorsuch, January 12, 1942.  
Carl A. Ostrom, January 12, 1942.  
Charles R. Shea, January 12, 1942.  
David J. Kennedy, January 12, 1942.  
Walter A. Weaver, May 5, 1942.  
Walter F. Hadtke, May 5, 1942.  
Paul A. Moore, May 5, 1942.  
Donald T. Balkema, May 5, 1942.  
John W. Pepper, Jr., May 5, 1942.  
Charles R. Bates, May 5, 1942.  
John L. Keshan, May 5, 1942.  
Herbert J. Towle, Jr., May 5, 1942.  
Clarence E. Dawson, May 5, 1942.  
William S. Rusk, May 5, 1942.  
Charles W. Miller, May 5, 1942.  
Edward J. Muller, May 5, 1942.  
James J. Kestly, May 5, 1942.  
Paul C. White, May 5, 1942.  
Robert S. Collins, May 5, 1942.

Ensign Richard P. Jeffrey to be an assistant paymaster in the Navy, with the rank of ensign, to rank from the 1st day of June 1939.

The following to be assistant paymasters in the Navy, with the rank of ensign, to rank from the date stated opposite their names:

Austin H. Barnett, Jr., November 6, 1940.  
Donald T. Rohde, November 6, 1940.  
George A. Reinhalter, November 6, 1940.  
Harold H. Blackman, November 6, 1940.  
Arromanus C. Lyles, Jr., November 18, 1941.  
William H. Bates, November 18, 1941.  
John T. Dollard, November 18, 1941.  
Julian W. McClure, November 18, 1941.  
Frederick A. Lyon, November 18, 1941.  
John S. Butler, November 18, 1941.  
Charles R. Ernst, November 18, 1941.

Lt. Comdr. George P. Hunter to be a commander in the Navy, to rank from the 1st day of January 1942.

Lt. Eldon C. Mayer to be a lieutenant commander in the Navy, to rank from the 1st day of January 1942.

The following-named lieutenants (junior grade) to be lieutenants in the Navy, to rank from the date stated opposite their names:

Robert S. Mandekorn, November 1, 1941.  
Constantine A. Karaberis, January 1, 1942.  
Surg. Robert K. Y. Dusenberre to be a medical inspector in the Navy, with the rank of commander, to rank from the 1st day of January 1942.

Assistant Paymaster Glenn W. Clegg to be a passed assistant paymaster in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant, to rank from the 1st day of January 1942.



The following-named boatswains to be chief boatswains in the Navy, to rank with but after ensign, from the date stated opposite their names:

Malcolm D. Balbirnie, December 2, 1941.  
William F. Moore, March 1, 1942.

The following-named machinists to be chief machinists in the Navy, to rank with but after ensign, from the date stated opposite their names:

Loren Henderson, March 1, 1942.  
George S. Watson, May 1, 1942.

Carpenter Roy C. Parlier to be a chief carpenter in the Navy, to rank with but after ensign, from the 1st day of May 1942.

The following-named lieutenants (junior grade) to be assistant civil engineers in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade), to rank from the 2d day of June 1941:

Joseph W. Frorath  
James Douglas

The following-named ensigns to be assistant civil engineers in the Navy, with the rank of ensign, to rank from the 1st day of June 1939:

Arthur B. Chilton, Jr.  
Richard T. Pratt  
Luther S. Reynolds

#### CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate May 14, 1942:

##### POSTMASTER

Glennie Flathers Whites, Iroquois, S. Dak.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, MAY 14, 1942

The House met at 12 o'clock noon, and was called to order by the Speaker.

The Reverend John M. Alexander, D. D., pastor of the First Presbyterian Church, Fayetteville, N. C., offered the following prayer:

God of our fathers, we thank Thee for our country and for the ideals upon which it was founded and for which it stands. Help us to be worthy of our heritage.

Keep always before us the conviction that the powers of government are ordained of God and that we are to render unto this Government the things that pertain thereto and to God the things that pertain to God.

Be with the President of these United States, with the Congress, and with all those who are entrusted by the people with the authority to rule over them. Give us that wisdom that comes down from above. Purify us of self-interest and may we be willing to lose ourselves in the preservation of that which we hold dearer than life.

We pray for Thy protection over our citizens called to the armed service, over those that are prisoners of war, over the wounded, and those preparing for battle. Grant that those who die may not have died in vain and that through their sacrifice we may build a new world wherein dwelleth right.

This we ask in the name of Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills of the House of the following titles:

On April 28, 1942:

H. R. 6736. An act making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, for civil functions administered by the War Department, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 6868. An act making additional appropriations for the national defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes.

On April 29, 1942:

H. R. 2320. An act to accept the cession by the States of North Carolina and Tennessee of exclusive jurisdiction over the lands embraced within the Great Smoky Mountains National Park, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5075. An act to create a Recreation Board for the District of Columbia, to define its duties, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 6799. An act to increase the monthly maximum number of flying hours of air pilots, as limited by the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, because of the military needs arising out of the present war.

On May 2, 1942:

H. R. 2192. An act authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Treasury to reimburse Carol D. Ward for the losses sustained by him by reason of the negligence of an employee of the Civilian Conservation Corps;

H. R. 4331. An act for the relief of Alice R. Swett;

H. R. 4408. An act for the relief of Alice R. Swett and the estate of Robert S. Swett;

H. R. 4981. An act for the relief of the Phoenix Construction Associates a partnership;

H. R. 5857. An act for the relief of Roy F. Lassly, former Acting Chief Disbursing Clerk, Department of the Interior, and G. F. Allen, Chief Disbursing Officer, Division of Disbursement, Treasury Department;

H. R. 5887. An act for the relief of Howard L. Miller;

H. R. 6328. An act for the relief of certain disbursing officers of the Army of the United States and for the settlement of individual claims approved by the War Department; and

H. R. 6641. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the establishment of a permanent instruction staff at the United States Coast Guard Academy," approved April 16, 1937.

On May 4, 1942:

H. R. 736. An act for the relief of Ideal Service Station;

H. R. 3476. An act for the relief of James A. Quillinan;

H. R. 4869. An act to provide for longevity credit for enlisted men of the Naval Reserve, Marine Corps Reserve, and the National Guard of the United States, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6020. An act granting the consent and approval of Congress to an interstate compact relating to the better utilization of the fisheries (marine, shell, and anadromous) of the Atlantic seaboard, and creating the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission; and

H. R. 6063. An act for the relief of the Clark County Lumber Co.

On May 5, 1942:

H. R. 809. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Vernon Clemons, Jr.;

H. R. 5596. An act for the relief of Tommy Huddleston;

H. R. 5962. An act to ratify and confirm act 20 of the Special Session Laws of Hawaii, 1941, extending the time within which revenue bonds may be issued and delivered un-

der act 174 of the Session Laws of Hawaii, 1935; and

H. R. 6166. An act to approve act No. 70 of the Special Session Laws of Hawaii, 1941, reducing the rate of interest on loans and providing for the reamortization of indebtedness to the Farm Loan Board.

On May 6, 1942:

H. R. 1154. An act for the relief of George C. Dewey;

H. R. 3767. An act for the relief of Frank Sheppard; and

H. R. 4657. An act for the relief of Floyd P. Moritzky.

On May 7, 1942:

H. R. 6804. An act providing for the suspension of annual assessment work on mining claims held by location in the United States, including the Territory of Alaska.

On May 9, 1942:

H. R. 139. An act to permit appeals by the United States to the circuit courts of appeals in certain cases.

On May 13, 1942:

H. R. 246. An act for the relief of Mrs. Murray Freeman;

H. R. 1901. An act for the relief of Floyd Odom;

H. R. 4579. An act to amend subsection (c) of section 1 of Public, No. 846, Seventy-fourth Congress (S. 3055), an act to provide conditions for the purchase of supplies and the making of contracts by the United States, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5563. An act for the relief of Joe A. Mumford and the estate of W. C. Mumford;

H. R. 5658. An act for the relief of James Warren;

H. R. 6594. An act for the relief of M. V. Forsythe;

H. R. 6874. An act to change the designation of the Bureau of Navigation of the Department of the Navy to the Bureau of Naval Personnel;

H. R. 6926. An act authorizing the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to grant an easement in certain lands of the Veterans' Administration facility, Jefferson Barracks, Mo., to the State of Missouri for highway purposes; and

H. R. 6932. An act to establish the composition of the United States Navy, to authorize the construction of certain naval vessels, and for other purposes.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a table.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED]?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a telegram received by me and one sent by me.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. O'NEAL]?

There was no objection.

Mr. PAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico [Mr. PAGAN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a letter from the President of the United States.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE]?

There was no objection.

#### PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. LELAND M. FORD]?

There was no objection.

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Speaker, under no conditions should there be any argument about the necessity of Congress attending congressional sessions, or going therefrom and thereto. This principle is definitely and positively settled under article I, section 6, of the Constitution of the United States, which says:

They—

The Senators and Representatives—shall in all cases, except treason, felony, and breach of the peace, be privileged from arrest during their attendance at the session of the respective houses, and in going to and returning from the same.

The principle set up here was to see that Congressmen and Senators actually reach their respective houses in order that no Congressman could be denied his vote, and no section be left unrepresented. It is self-evident that if means of transportation, and that means automobile travel today, were denied, Senators and Congressmen could not fully perform their duties.

This is an old principle and definitely settled many years before those who would deny Congressmen transportation were born. The point in the case today is whether we have or have not a Constitution and are going to live by it. The newspaper commentators, radio stations, and all other sources of news had better watch this definite and positive effort of those who are trying to destroy Congress and throw the Constitution aside, and let them not forget that, under that same Constitution, freedom of the press will be lost if the Congress and the Constitution are destroyed.

Great stress has been laid upon the X cards issued to Congress. There are only 435 Congressmen. My understanding is that some 5,800 X cards were issued on the first day, and the Department says this is now secret information. Why secret? Is this a form of Gestapo procedure? Who are these people who have immunity through secrecy against Congress? Are their duties higher than those of the Congress of the United States, that they enjoy such privileges? Turn the spotlight upon those who give this secrecy.

#### PROGRAM FOR NEXT WEEK

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK]?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time in order to inquire of the majority leader as to the program for next week.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I am very glad the acting minority leader asks that question. There will be nothing before next Wednesday. As a matter of fact, there is nothing on the program at this time for next week. I know of nothing now that will come on during the week. There will be nothing before Wednesday, and I doubt if there will be anything on either Wednesday or Thursday of next week.

Answering the question, I can definitely say there will be nothing before next Wednesday. Of course, there might be requests of a unanimous-consent nature where everybody agrees. That is, where all the minority Members are agreed and the majority leadership agrees, and the Speaker recognizes someone to bring up a matter by unanimous consent, something that is not controversial. There will be nothing controversial, and there will be nothing before Wednesday of a controversial nature. I know of nothing for the remainder of the week.

Mr. HALLECK. I thank the gentleman.

#### GASOLINE RATIONING FOR ENTIRE COUNTRY

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE]?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, there have been intimations from official circles in Washington to the effect that gasoline rationing would be extended to the entire country. Rationing is necessary along the eastern seaboard at this time. This is because of a shortage of transportation, not gasoline. There are adequate supplies of gasoline in the Middle West and along the Gulf coast. There are no transportation difficulties in connection with its distribution. As far as supply is concerned, there are excessive quantities in storage, and in many instances producing wells are shut down to a point where they are permitted to produce 5 percent or less of their potential production. Certainly under these conditions rationing is not justified. Such a program will not help the war effort. It will hinder it by tying up essential transportation and interfering with agricultural production, which in that area is largely mechanized.

There have been intimations that there should be rationing of gasoline, even if not otherwise needed, to conserve rubber. There is no justification for such a proposal. Conservation of rubber is one thing, conservation of gasoline is another. The American people are perfectly willing to abide by such restrictions as may be necessary to conserve rubber. They are obeying cheerfully the regulations which have been imposed in connection with tire rationing and tire use. They will continue to do so. To even intimate that in order to conserve tires it is necessary to deny gasoline is a reflection upon both the intelligence and patriotism of the American people.

A Washington newspaper recently suggested in its editorial columns that gaso-

line rationing should be imposed upon the entire country on the theory of equality of sacrifice. What a ridiculous position to take. On that theory, people along the Atlantic seaboard should not be permitted to use bathing beaches because we do not have any in Kansas and Oklahoma. I can conceive of nothing which would more injuriously affect the morale of our people than to impose unnecessary restrictions which not only would not help the war effort, but which would distinctly injure it. In times like these many mistakes will be made with the best of intentions, but there is no excuse for the deliberate adoption of policies which cannot be justified under any conditions. To impose gasoline rationing on those parts of the country where it is not needed would undermine morale, lessen confidence in Government, and seriously impede the war effort.

#### EXCELLENT

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, last Tuesday the Jeffrey Manufacturing Co., in Columbus, Ohio, was awarded the Navy E for excellence in the production of vital naval equipment. I wish to record here my pride and gratification at this award. It is a well-deserved tribute to a splendid organization. It will be an inspiration to others to excel in the struggle for victory, which demands the best in all of us.

This award, however, has a broader significance. This was the tenth plant in Ohio to receive the Navy E out of 80 which have been awarded in the Nation.

Here in Washington we read a lot of columnists who say that the Middle West is apathetic about the war. The Navy apparently thinks differently. They have said of production in plants in my district and my State, "Production is excellent."

Here is a comment from a British source, from the Memorandum of Information on Foreign Affairs and the World Crisis, issued by the Research Group, London, England, in their May 1942 issue, which is devoted to a worldwide survey of the war situation. Referring to the war effort in America, the Memorandum says:

The most realistic people are to be found in the Middle West, where there is a calm and sound understanding of the war. Moreover, they are getting on with their difficult task far better than any other part of the country. In the East and West there is, of course, tremendous activity, but it is spasmodic and too little coordinated. Production only goes up when there is bad news and a sense of danger and dies down again when things look calmer. In the Middle West, on the other hand, there are really well-planned efforts, with production steadily increasing. Our observer visited some war factories in the big Middle West cities, and was deeply impressed with the progress and the



efficiency and foresight with which it has all been planned.

One of the reasons for the contradictory reports which are constantly arriving from America about the efficiency and progress of production is the wide gap between the performance of the middle western cities as against those of the far West and the East.

Apparently Britain and the American Navy think Ohio and the Middle West are doing all right.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a letter from a constituent.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. O'HARA]?

There was no objection.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD upon four subjects and to include the necessary insertions.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. CARTWRIGHT]?

There was no objection.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG]?

There was no objection.

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an address delivered by Pierre Van Paassen at a dinner tendered to him by the committee for a Jewish army. The Public Printer advises me that this will exceed the legal limit, but I ask that it be printed notwithstanding.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. YOUNGDAHL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial from the Minneapolis Tribune.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

#### RUBBER PRODUCTION

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable Claude R. Wickard, Secretary of Agriculture, made a significant suggestion a few days ago in a statement before a Senate subcommittee.

Mr. Wickard proposed that a big share of the millions of bushels of surplus grain be turned into synthetic rubber by way of industrial alcohol. The other principal ingredient is cotton of which there is ample supply.

He proposes that if existing plants, the distilleries now in operation, were used to the limit for making industrial alcohol, 80,000,000 bushels of wheat or corn could be turned into 200,000,000 gallons of alcohol that would produce enough butadiene—a substitute for rubber—to produce 240,000 tons of rubber, after

allowing a sufficient production of alcohol for war purposes.

Why not follow Mr. Wickard's suggestion? Why not use this equipment to the limit and produce synthetic rubber along with alcohol for munitions and forget about alcoholic liquor for the duration. Mr. Wickard's statement follows:

STATEMENT BY SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE  
CLAUDE R. WICKARD BEFORE A HEARING OF THE  
SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON  
AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY INVESTIGATING  
USES OF FARM CROPS IN PRODUCTION OF ALCOHOL AND SYNTHETIC RUBBER

Scientists of the Department of Agriculture have been investigating commercial possibilities of manufacturing rubber substitutes from grains and other farm products. Originally these researches were part of a broad effort to find new uses for agricultural surpluses. Since war broke out in the Far East the Department's work on rubber substitutes has been intensified because of the pressing need for augmenting the Nation's supplies of rubber for military and civilian use. Maintenance of adequate supplies of tires is especially important to agriculture. Unless tires are available, particularly next year and thereafter, crop production will be considerably hampered and the movement of farm products to processors and consumers will be seriously threatened.

In recent months most of the Department's work on possible rubber substitutes has been centralized in the Peoria, Ill., regional research laboratory. I visited that laboratory recently and can report that much progress is being made in exploring many phases of the manufacture of rubber substitutes from plentiful farm products.

After full discussions with members of my technical staff at the Department, I am convinced that immediate attention should be given to expanding the present program for butadiene production from grain alcohol, so as to make possible greater production of synthetic rubber during the calendar year 1943.

I believe that use of part of our reserve stocks of corn and wheat as raw material for butadiene offers the best possibility of greatly increasing our production of synthetic rubber as early as next year.

Large stocks of wheat and corn are available. In fact, it is likely that thousands of bushels of wheat will be lost through lack of suitable storage space unless they can be put to use quickly. Scarcity of materials is adding to the huge problem of constructing sufficient storage for this year's wheat crop. The manufacture of ethyl alcohol from grain is a well-established commercial process. The process of converting 95-percent alcohol to butadiene is technically established, although to my knowledge it has not heretofore been used on a commercial basis in this country. I understand, however, that the Rubber Reserve Company already has made an allocation for a substantial amount of butadiene to be produced from ethyl alcohol and that a plant for this operation is under construction. Alcohol has been used in Russia, Poland, Germany, and other European countries for the production of butadiene.

As I have said, the raw materials—corn and wheat—are readily at hand. Considerable expansion of facilities for making alcohol out of grain is possible in existing plants with the use of relatively small amounts of copper and steel. Available data indicate that if existing plants were converted to high-proof alcohol production at least 200,000,000 gallons of alcohol for making butadiene could be produced after allowing for production of alcohol for war purposes. It should be understood, however, that production of this total quantity of alcohol would require complete mobilization of the entire alcohol industry.

About 80,000,000 bushels of wheat or corn would be required to produce 200,000,000 gallons of alcohol, which, in turn, could produce 220,000 tons of butadiene. This would make approximately 240,000 tons of synthetic rubber. That is the approximate volume of synthetic-rubber production which could be obtained from grain through existing distilling plants converted to high-proof alcohol production by the use of a minimum quantity of critical metals. Beyond production of about 240,000 tons of synthetic rubber, processing facilities would be a limiting factor. Supplies of raw materials—wheat and corn—are sufficient for expanding synthetic-rubber production by many times that amount.

Supplies of corn and other feed grains are ample, and our wheat supply is the largest in our history. We will start the new crop year July 1 with a wheat carry-over of 630,000,000 bushels. When this year's crop comes in, we will have a total supply not far from 1,500,000,000 bushels. That is enough to meet all normal needs for about 2 years. With such an oversupply of grain and such a critical situation in rubber, we surely should explore every possible means of turning some of the surplus wheat into synthetic rubber. Use of grains for making additional alcohol would not in any way cut into possible uses for other war purposes.

Incidentally, we also have plentiful supplies of the second most important raw material in tires. Ample cotton is available for use in any additional tires made possible by increased supplies of synthetic rubber. Despite the heavy production in most branches of the cotton-textile industry, I am told that the equipment for making tire fabric is now largely unused. It cannot be adapted for other purposes.

In view of the facts which I have outlined, we should move ahead at once on a program of making synthetic rubber from grain by way of alcohol. Of course, there are other possibilities. In this Department, alone, much work is being done in the Peoria laboratory which looks to improvement of the method I have outlined, and to other methods of making rubber substitutes from grain that in the long run may prove to be quicker and more efficient. This research work is going ahead all the time, and I believe it holds great possibilities. Meanwhile, information already is available on a process which is practicable now.

Therefore, I am urging strongly that serious consideration be given to using at least 80,000,000 bushels of grain, and if possible more, as soon as possible, in the manufacture of synthetic rubber.

#### GASOLINE SUPPLIES

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to read a letter from the Secretary of the Binghamton Automobile Club with regard to the gasoline supply in my territory:

BINGHAMTON AUTOMOBILE CLUB, INC.,  
Binghamton, N. Y., May 13, 1942.  
Congressman EDWIN A. HALL,  
House Office Building,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR ED: In reply to your telegram with reference to the available amount of gasoline to our community, it looks very good. I have been trying to get information with reference to pipe lines and where they would come from but everybody seems to be very cagey about giving out any information. However, I believe that with the Sun Oil pipe line and the

new pipe line that the Standard Oil Co. has put in, which is now in operation, it would be ample to supply our needs if their facilities were open to other companies.

I understand that the Sun pipe line is pumping the gasoline from Marcus Hook through to Syracuse, which also supplies the Sun Oil Co. here in Binghamton. If this line was reversed, a great deal of gasoline could be pumped into this area from supplies that are coming from the West. This, of course, would eliminate the use of truck transports which would help to preserve tires and also gasoline which are the two essentials which we are trying to preserve at the present time.

Trusting that this is the information that you desire, and hoping that you will be successful in securing an exemption for this area, I am

Very truly yours,

BINGHAMTON AUTOMOBILE CLUB, INC.,  
A. L. JACOBS, Secretary.

P. S.—The Standard Oil pipe line pumps from Buffalo to Willow Point.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to extend my remarks and include therein an editorial appearing in Tuesday's Chicago Tribune entitled "Somebody Else, Not Me"; also a release from the Indiana Tax Study Committee entitled "Government As Usual."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

(Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

#### GOVERNMENT EXPENDITURES

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, we have been informed by the majority leader that we have nothing to do from now until next Wednesday. I think I can suggest something the Members of the Congress might do. If you will look at the Treasury statement you will see that we have gone into the red up until May 11, \$15,500,000,000, and that we are going into the red faster every day. Then you might try to study out some way of stopping the inequalities and the enormous extravagances that are going on.

If you will read the RECORD of day before yesterday you will find that I showed that the Pennsylvania farmers got 2 percent of the value of their farm marketings whereas those in Mississippi got 23 percent. Yesterday's RECORD shows that the farmers in the State of Michigan got 3 percent, Alabama 24 percent, and Texas 16 percent.

If you will make a comparison of the amounts going to the States, you will find that a large amount of money is being expended in some of the States in a way that seems to me to be very unethical. The amounts involved in the contracts that have been let are enormous. We should try to stop this extravagance.

[Here the gavel fell.]

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a statement by Mr. A. A. Potter on war finance.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

SETTLEMENT OF CLAIMS OF AMERICAN NATIONALS AGAINST THE GOVERNMENT OF MEXICO—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 722)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

*To the Congress of the United States:*

I transmit herewith a report by the Secretary of State recommending the enactment of legislation to provide for the settlement of claims of American nationals against the Government of Mexico comprehended within the terms of agreements concluded by the United States and Mexico.

I commend to the favorable consideration of the Congress the recommendation of the Secretary of State in which I concur.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, May 14, 1942.

[Enclosure: Report.]

#### RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 7008) to authorize the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to issue notes, bonds, and debentures in the sum of \$5,000,000,000 in excess of existing authority.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

Mr. RICH. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, what is Jesse Jones going to do with the \$5,000,000,000?

Mr. STEAGALL. It is going to be spent principally in promotion of the war program.

Mr. RICH. In what way? The war program is a pretty large program.

Mr. STEAGALL. That is correct.

Mr. RICH. We have appropriated \$80,000,000,000 since January 22.

Mr. STEAGALL. That did not go to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, as the gentleman knows. I have sent for the testimony so that I can give figures on this matter, if desired, but I may say that a large portion of this fund has already been committed in connection with the purchase of materials, the development of plants, and other things in connection with the war program. Mr. Jones was before the Committee on Banking and Currency and made a complete statement and gave figures in detail covering what has been done up to this time and what is expected to be done

with this fund. The committee unhesitatingly gave the measure a unanimous report.

Mr. RICH. It seems to me that the Members of Congress should not turn all this power over to a committee or to Jesse Jones without all of us having an explanation of it. We certainly ought to be informed about what is going on. Since we declared war, on December 8, we have appropriated fabulous sums of money. We have turned it over to the President, the Army, and the Navy, and we see the results. We find an enormous amount of waste and extravagance has been going on under the contracts that have been let. This is certainly a responsibility of Congress and we should not permit anything of that kind. But when we turn it over to one of the bureaus or to the President or to the Army or the Navy, then a responsibility that was ours ceases to be our responsibility.

Mr. STEAGALL. As the gentleman understands, the bill does not carry any appropriation. It is simply an extension of the authorization with respect to the lending powers of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and for other activities in connection with the war program. I think the gentleman recognizes that the membership of the House has the utmost confidence in the administration of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

Mr. RICH. I am not questioning the ability of Jesse Jones. He is a great man, as they all say he is, but the trouble is he has 18 different jobs that have been handed over to him. He has 10 times more than any man, even as big a man as Jesse Jones can handle. I do not know that he has time to see that everything that is done in the R. F. C. is correct or not. Possibly it is, and I am not criticizing them; but with all the available men in the country, I do not believe we should turn over 18 or 20 large jobs to one man, because we have other men that ought to be equally responsible who can give their time and attention to the details of these offices. I think we are running ourselves loose in the heel here. We are squandering money, and some day the taxpayers of this country are going to be in a terrible fix. And not only the taxpayers, but everybody else in America. If you are going to win this war, you have got to give the very best you have, and I think you ought to make a report to the Congress and tell us how he is going to use this money. I do not think we should permit these unanimous-consent requests to go through like this.

Mr. Speaker, until the gentleman presents to the House some figures, I shall object.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman withhold his objection and yield to me a moment?

Mr. RICH. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WOLCOTT. This matter was thoroughly thrashed out in committee and the figures show that up to the present time, commitments have been made by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for all purposes, principally defense purposes, of nearly \$13,000,000,000.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Nearly \$14,000,000,000.



Mr. WOLCOTT. Thirteen billion six hundred million dollars, or some other major fraction. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation has a lending capacity of about \$9,100,000,000. There is no question but what the defense program is being held up because the Reconstruction Finance Corporation has exhausted all of its available lending authority. This report was a unanimous report from the Banking and Currency Committee, not only because we had every possible faith and confidence in Mr. Jones to administer it—and I might say parenthetically that even though Mr. Jones has been given a great many other jobs to do he has never lost contact with the administration of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. He is, to my way of thinking, doing one of the most splendid jobs in the war effort of any of the agencies of Government. I do not want to take the responsibility of holding up plant expansion. I do not want to take the responsibility of holding up the acquisition of strategic and critical materials. I do not want to take the responsibility of holding up the marketing of essential materials or the acquiring of essential materials to carry on the war effort. I think the gentleman knows me and the other members on this side of the Banking and Currency Committee well enough to know that unless we had been thoroughly convinced that there was immediate need for this increased authorization we never would have consented that this bill be brought up in this manner. We are withholding any objection to it because we have been thoroughly convinced that there is immediate need for this money. I hope the gentleman will not object.

The chairman of the committee has available the figures which can be put into the Record, but they are substantially as I have given them, and I am not so sure but that they are available at the present time, so that perhaps the chairman of the committee can give within reasonable limits a break-down of the activity of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, which I think will convince the gentleman that there is justification for increasing this authorization. I wish the gentleman would yield to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. STEAGALL] for that purpose, because of course it should go into the Record.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I shall do that, but I say that we should realize that the members of the Committee on Banking and Currency have their responsibilities, and we have no reason to doubt that they are fulfilling them to the best of their ability. I do not question Mr. Jesse Jones and his ability. I am not doing that at all, but I do know that since January 1 we have appropriated \$70,000,000,000 to the President and the Army and the Navy, and the gentleman knows and I know that the contracts that have been let have been proven to be exorbitant, and that the profits have been so great that contractors are turning them back by the millions of dollars. We do not want anything like that to happen. It was because of our desire to help the country 100 percent that we permitted these bills to go through. We find that in giving a clean sweep to it,

we were wrong. If the responsibility rests on the Army and the Navy and the President to see that the contracts that are made are made with due diligence and care, so that we have no waste and no extravagance, then I want to know if the gentleman will give assurance that the \$5,000,000,000, to be passed by unanimous consent, will be wisely and judiciously expended, and that we will have no graft or exorbitant profits made by anyone. We want to help this country 100 percent, but I want to be sure of that, and I want somebody to give us that assurance. I think the chairman of the committee owes a duty to do that and give that assurance to the House.

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Speaker, I assure the gentleman that the Committee on Banking and Currency is unanimously of the opinion that such is the case. The bill comes here with a unanimous report, after full attendance of the committee, and after the committee considered the figures in detail.

Mr. RICH. Then, Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my objection; but I do hope, if for any reason anything we pass here now has the name of national defense or the prosecution of this war upon it, that the Members of the House will do their duty, because it will require the best that is in each and every one of us if we are going to win this war and save this country, and everybody knows that the thing to do is to do our best and that will test us to the limit.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object. I recall in the reports made on the spending of the lease-lend funds that great amounts had been expended for extension and building of munitions plants. We have also been given to understand that large portions of the \$170,000,000,000, which the Congress has appropriated for national defense, has been expended for similar purposes. The remarks of my colleague from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] is the first intimation I have had that it has been necessary to secure funds from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation with which to build an extension to an already existing plant, or to build new plants. That is the first intimation that I have had of that condition, and inasmuch as we have appropriated the amount of money we have for the different war activities, including the activity under discussion, it seems to me that it ought not to be necessary to further arm the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for this purpose, in addition to the funds the War and Navy Departments already have to do this particular type of work.

Mr. STEAGALL. Of course, we have thought it desirable to do as much as possible by private capital in carrying out the war program. I think that is the desirable thing to do. That is what we have been doing down to this time, and it has resulted in saving enormous sums of money for the Government.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. May I say that while I am reluctant to permit this bill to be passed by unanimous con-

sent, I will withhold an objection only because of the fact that I know the members of the gentleman's very fine committee are every one of them endowed with good judgment and a high degree of integrity. As the bill was reported by their vote, I bow to their superior judgment.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. STEAGALL. Certainly.

Mr. CRAWFORD. For the benefit of my colleague the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOODRUFF] and my colleague the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH], permit me to say if they will refer to the report issued by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation under date of March 21 last, they will find one of the most illuminating, clear-cut statements of the activities of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation that has ever been published. In that Mr. Jones, Chairman, points out the expenditures in connection with the War Defense Plant Corporation, Metals Reserve Company, Rubber Reserve Company, and several other activities. You will find that several billion dollars have been spent and committed by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for the specific purpose of building great defense plants throughout the United States, several of which have been located in Michigan, and that from the very beginning of this program we authorized the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to set up the Defense Plant Corporation, so that that agency of government could proceed to build these plants. It has done so. It has operating agreements with the people who are now operating the plants. They are owned by an agency of the United States Government. This additional amount of \$5,000,000,000 is to be used in further expanding the operations as set forth in detail by the March 21, 1942, report of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

I call that to your attention because I think you should have that information.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEAGALL. I yield.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. I wish to say that nothing I have said in any way casts any reflection upon Mr. Jones. I consider him a public official of a very, very high type. While I am willing to approve this bill under the circumstances that exist and the request by the chairman of the committee, I am at least in part impelled to do that by my admiration for the man who will have administration of these funds.

Mr. CRAWFORD. If the chairman will yield for one other observation.

Mr. STEAGALL. Certainly.

Mr. CRAWFORD. We should keep in mind that under the lend-lease operations certain types of plant have been and are now being constructed. Under the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Defense Plant Corporation other operations are conducted. Then the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is making loans to corporations for the purpose of expanding their own facilities where those plants are owned by corporations which are adding additions to their plants. Commercial banks and Federal

Reserve banks are making loans for several purposes to the corporations of this country.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEAGALL. I yield.

Mr. STEFAN. I would like to ask the distinguished chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee if it is not a fact that the hearings on which you are basing this unanimous consent request to extend the loaning power of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation were public? They were public hearings?

Mr. STEAGALL. Oh, yes.

Mr. STEFAN. Everybody seems to know something about them except Members of the House. I wonder if it would not be in order, in order that we all might know something about them, to put those commitments or what you think is public, into the Record, so that we will know something about them?

Mr. STEAGALL. I will be glad to extend my remarks and incorporate the figures. It would take some time to read them at the moment.

Mr. STEFAN. Now, is it not a fact that it is absolutely necessary to make rubber today, to get steel and many other critical materials that the Army now needs?

Mr. STEAGALL. Oh, yes; one reason for the request for this legislation by this method today is the fact that if it is not done it will be delayed a week. That should not be done.

Mr. STEFAN. Will the gentleman tell the membership of the House the amount of money that is in this bill for the allocation of money to make synthetic rubber? How much is there in this bill to the petroleum interests to make rubber? Is there not a matter of \$650,000,000 for synthetic rubber alone?

Mr. STEAGALL. I think it is something like that. I can supply the exact figure.

Mr. STEFAN. The gentleman in his extension of remarks will include those figures?

Mr. STEAGALL. Yes. I will say this, that commitments have been made to a point that will probably exhaust the funds provided for under this bill, but we have the assurance of Mr. Jones that as far as they can see at this time the Reconstruction Finance Corporation will not be required to ask for additional lending authority very soon.

Mr. STEFAN. The fact of the matter is that \$350,000,000 for synthetic rubber is merely a drop in the bucket? It will have to be more than that, will it not?

Mr. STEAGALL. They have made extensive plans already for the production of rubber, that runs up to 800,000 tons annually.

Mr. STEFAN. That is 700,000 with the petroleum interests and 100,000 tons by Union Carbide?

There is going to be a demand for additional synthetic rubber. It is absolutely necessary to get bills like this passed so that the Reconstruction Finance Corporation can get this work started. The gentleman in the extension of his remarks should convey some information to the membership.

Mr. STEAGALL. I will put it in the Record.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I wonder if, as a part of the gentleman's remarks, he will not include the statement made by Jesse Jones before the Banking and Currency Committee yesterday; and if he intends to do that, in his behalf I will ask unanimous consent that in the revision and extension of his remarks he be allowed to include the statement made by Mr. Jones as a part of the hearings before the Banking and Currency Committee yesterday. I believe this will completely answer all of the questions in respect of the break-down and the reason why this additional \$5,000,000,000 of authorization is needed.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Jones made the following statement:

We have authorized expenditures in connection with the war program of something like \$13,000,000,000. That is much more than we have funds available to pay for.

Our present borrowing authority is approximately \$9,100,000,000. We now owe about \$3,750,000,000. So that would not leave enough to pay for the things that we will have to pay for, that we are already committed for. The \$5,000,000,000 would just about be enough if we do not make any more commitments. But we are making more commitments every day.

However, we will be getting back something. We are getting back something now from the plants that we have built. We are getting back rents or payments as the case may be. On the materials that we buy and sell we are getting back some money.

I hope that we will not have to come back for any more than this amount, although it depends entirely on how much more work we do in connection with the war program. I will name some of the items that make up that total. I am sure that you will be interested in knowing them.

There are approximately \$2,000,000,000 for the construction of plants for the manufacture of aircraft, \$360,000,000 for the manufacture of magnesium, \$700,000,000 for the manufacture of synthetic rubber, \$734,000,000 for the expansion of the steel industry, \$468,000,000 for plants for the manufacture of ordnance, and \$182,000,000 for building shipyards.

The expenditure for the production of aluminum with which to make airplanes will increase the capacity in this country of aluminum to 2,100,000,000 pounds a year. Two years ago it was 300,000,000 pounds. One year ago it was 540,000,000 pounds. So it is multiplying by seven times its status 2 years ago.

The magnesium will run about 600,000,000 pounds. That is about 20 times the capacity a year ago.

The money allocated for the synthetic rubber should bring in about 800,000 tons of rubber.

We contracted to buy 1,370,000,000 pounds of aluminum from Canada. Including the immediate capacity, that is, the capacity today of aluminum manufactured in this country, plus the modest amount that we are getting from Canada, it will give us about a billion pounds at this time.

So that the program now has not been retarded and is not being retarded for the lack of aluminum. But, of course, the program increases in that respect. The plants manufacturing planes next year will be double what they are this year. But we expect to have the aluminum.

Those plants will all be completed—there are several more coming in the next two or three months—they should all be finished in

the very early part of next year. I do not think that we will have any draw-backs from that source.

The rubber plants, depending upon getting the materials, should all be finished in 1942 and 1943. That does, however, depend upon getting the materials with which to build the plants.

A very large item in our commitments is one that we do not have to draw upon very much, and that is the purchase of machine tools.

As most of you probably know, the lack of machine tools in converting our peacetime manufacturing enterprises into war required retooling all the plants. First and last, we have bought and agreed to buy \$1,395,000,000 worth of machine tools. But that money is not invested very long, because someone buys these tools usually as soon as they are ready. Some industry buys them right away. But the manufacturer of the tools must have gotten unqualified orders or he cannot borrow the money and buy the material to do the manufacturing.

I might say, too, that the machine-tool situation is improving very rapidly.

We started operating our tin smelter about a month ago. We have more than a year's supply of ore on hand in this country, which we have gotten from Bolivia.

We have accumulated a substantial amount of all kinds of critical and strategic materials. We have gotten out and bought everything that we needed that we could buy anywhere in the world.

Either England or ourselves have been getting all the critical materials and metals from South America for more than a year. We bought some 30 or 40 different kinds of critical material from that many countries.

We brought into this country some three or four hundred million pounds of wool from Australia, New Zealand, and South Africa. The trade in this country is also buying wool, and has been buying wool from South America. There will undoubtedly be a shortage in wool.

We contracted to buy the entire crop of sugar of Cuba this year, and will probably do the same next year. That will entail about \$200,000,000. That, of course, is outside of what they need for their own use.

We are buying hides, probably \$40,000,000 worth of hides.

We financed some 48 aviation schools for teaching primary courses in aviation. On completion of these courses the students go to the Army advanced schools where they get their finished training.

We bought practically all of the privately owned airplanes in this country and turned them over to the Army.

As you know, we have through recent legislation been undertaking to buy and finance automobile purchases, tires, and other such things as are frozen and will be frozen.

We are financing the construction of aviation hundred-octane gasoline plants. We have spent from two hundred and twenty-five to two hundred and fifty million dollars in that respect.

Then we agreed to buy the product from these plants for a period of 3 years; and our obligation in that respect runs to \$1,100,000,000.

That is necessary, because the Army and the Navy can only buy what they have appropriations to buy; and the manufacturers must have a definite order in that case, the same as with the machine tools. They cannot go ahead and manufacture this product without knowing that it is going to be sold.

In our plan industry is putting in about \$100,000,000 of new equipment.

We are salvaging scrap materials and metals of all kinds. We are planning now to buy tires, if anybody has an extra tire. I do not know whether they have or not. But we are planning to do that at the request of the War Production Board.



We are building additional plants. We financed a nickel mine and smelter in Cuba at a cost of some \$20,000,000. We spent more than that in increasing the copper production in Chile, Peru, and other places in South America. We have a large mine in Mexico that we are going to open up.

We have commitments for developing our own metals and materials, in the West principally, running probably \$1,100,000,000. In fact, we are doing a little bit of everything and a good deal of many things.

As I said, these commitments to date aggregate some thirteen or fourteen billion dollars, and we need the five billion that we have asked for, or will need it.

We paid out about two and one-fourth billion dollars up to date, and it is going out now pretty fast. It is going out at the rate of about ten or twelve million dollars a day.

Everything that we are doing is done at the request of the policy-making agencies and the War and Navy Departments and the Maritime Commission, the War Production Board, and the Board of Economic Warfare. We make no policies, but we carry out the plans and recommendations made by these other agencies.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I should like to ask the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency a question in regard to S. 2250 which was passed by the Senate a long time ago, and I believe the gentleman's committee has passed on it. I wonder whether it is the gentleman's plan to bring that bill up today immediately after this \$5,000,000,000?

Mr. STEAGALL. I may say to the gentleman from South Dakota that I sought on yesterday to reach an agreement by which that legislation might be taken up today, but in view of the plans that have been agreed upon by the leadership of the House, and which I am sure would meet with the approval of the gentleman, it was thought we could not take up that legislation before probably Wednesday of next week. This would depend, of course, upon the program.

Mr. MUNDT. I want to say as one Member of the House that I believe this bill should be expedited. It has been held up for a long time. The conversion of business to war production is just as important to the advancement of this war as the approval of the \$5,000,000,000 for the R. F. C.

Mr. STEAGALL. I may say to the gentleman from South Dakota that the Committee on Banking and Currency gave prompt attention to the legislation and held only what we considered necessary hearings to get desired information. We hope to get the bill up before many days. We are ready to do it now if the program of the House would permit.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I should like to ask the gentleman this question: As I understand it, when the Defense Plants Corporation decides to build a plant, the plant is built for the purpose of leasing it to a certain corporation under the terms, generally speaking, of a 5-year lease, with the understanding that at the conclusion of that period or at the conclusion of the war that corporation should have the option to purchase that plant at cost plus depreciation if it wants to, but if it does not choose to, then the Defense Plants

Corporation may dispose of it in any way it sees fit.

Mr. STEAGALL. That is correct as to the general practice, but not in every case.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Is that the general purpose of these contracts?

Mr. STEAGALL. I think so, but there are cases where the option is reserved to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Does the gentleman know, or can he get for us the information as to what happened in the case of the contract with the Bethlehem Steel Corporation at Sparrows Point regarding which my information was that this plant was to be built upon land belonging to the Corporation and that the lease was to run for a very long period of time indeed?

Mr. STEAGALL. I have not inquired into the particular transaction to which the gentleman refers, but I should be glad to do so and furnish the gentleman the information.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. A great many of these contracts have been entered into with corporations and the terms of the contract were reasonable. I believe we ought not to allow any single instance to arise wherein that is not the case.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the amount of notes, bonds, debentures, and other such obligations which the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is authorized to issue and have outstanding at any time under existing law is hereby increased by \$5,000,000,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### THE MILITARY ESTABLISHMENTS

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 4476) to provide for sundry matters affecting the Military Establishment, with Senate amendments, disagree to the Senate amendments, and ask for a conference with the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. MAY, THOMASON, HARTER, ANDREWS, and SHORT.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and to include therein a radio broadcast out of Great Falls by Mr. Fred Atter, of Montana.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted, as follows:

To Mr. BUCK, for today, on account of official business.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 45 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, May 18, 1942, at 12 o'clock noon.

#### COMMITTEE HEARINGS

##### COMMITTEE ON RIVERS AND HARBORS

The Committee on Rivers and Harbors will hold hearings commencing Monday, May 18, 1942, at 10:30 a. m., on H. R. 6999, a bill authorizing the construction and operation of a pipe line and a navigable barge channel across Florida to connect the Atlantic and Gulf Intracoastal Waterways, thus providing a through inland channel for the transportation of oil, gasoline, sulfur, and other war materials.

##### COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 10 a. m., Tuesday, May 19, 1942.

Business to be considered: The hearings in connection with the Federal Communications Commission will be resumed on May 19 at 10 a. m.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

1637. Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, a letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a report on lists of papers recommended for disposal by certain agencies of the Federal Government, was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

#### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. R. 7088. A bill to codify and enact into absolute law title 2 of the United States Code; to the Committee on Revision of the Laws.

By Mr. BROOKS:

H. R. 7089. A bill to safeguard the health of persons in military service by requiring that registered pharmacists be placed in charge of Army dispensaries; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FENTON:

H. R. 7090. A bill to provide an engineering study of the mine-water problem of the Pennsylvania anthracite mining area for the purpose of obtaining information and presenting a solution relating to the health, safety, and economic conditions of the area, State, and Nation as affected by the encroachment of water which progressively floods the mines, threatens to destroy the anthracite coal reserves of the Nation, contributes to a waste of a valuable natural resource, contributes to excessive acid mine water and silt in the Pennsylvania streams, and seriously affects the whole economy of the anthracite mining area; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

By Mr. FULMER:

H. R. 7091. A bill to provide for improving the functioning of the cooperative features of the Federal Land Bank System; to relieve Federal land-bank borrowers of stock liability; to organize the Federal land banks

and the national farm-loan associations as membership corporations and to provide for placing Federal land banks on a self-supporting basis, and for increasing the functions and responsibilities of national farm-loan associations; to establish a method for determining the interest rates on Federal land-bank and Land Bank Commissioner loans; to provide for refunding and guaranteeing certain bonds of such banks; to establish a method for adjusting certain agricultural indebtedness; to provide for limiting the taking of deficiency judgments by Federal land banks and by the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WADSWORTH:

H. R. 7092. A bill to regulate in the United States Court of Claims suits for payment for the use of inventions used by or for the Government; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CANNON of Missouri:

H. J. Res. 314. Joint resolution making an additional appropriation for the marine and war-risk insurance fund; to the Committee on Appropriations.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

Mr. LESINSKI introduced a bill (H. R. 7093) for the relief of Christ Paul; which was referred to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

2813. By Mr. GRAHAM: Petition of Rev. Remo I. Robb, pastor, and 54 members of the First Reformed Presbyterian Church, urging an early passage of Senate bill 860, to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the land and naval forces of the United States, and to provide for the suppression of vice in vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2814. Also, petition of 56 citizens of Beaver County, Pa., urging the early passage of Senate bill 860 to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the land and naval forces of the United States, and to provide for the suppression of vice in vicinity of military camps, and naval establishments; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2815. By Mr. HEIDINGER: Petition of Mrs. R. G. Putnam, of Eldorado, Ill., signed by some 400 representative citizens of southeastern Illinois, urging the adoption of Senate bill 860 as a part of our national defense program; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2816. Also, petition of Marjorie Gray, signed at the Church of the Nazarene of Flora, Ill., by Maggie Odell and sundry other members of the church, requesting the passage of Senate bill 860; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2817. By Mr. KRAMER: Petition of the Associated District Newspapers of the southern area of the State of California, of which Harry A. Lawson, publisher of the Eagle Rock Sentinel, Eagle Rock, Calif., is an officer, earnestly and urgently requesting the United States Treasury to carry on a newspaper advertising campaign designed to sell securities in order to stabilize the newspaper industry, who has cooperated so generously in advertising the need for the buying of United States Government securities for the successful prosecution of the war effort; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2818. By Mr. ROLPH: Resolution of Irrigation Districts Association, of California, San Francisco, adopted April 17, 1942, regarding the California State guard; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2819. By Mr. JONES: Petition of Conrad Roediger, Anna Roediger, Bertha Smith, and Cloice Smith, of route 2, Wapakoneta, Ohio, in behalf of the enactment of Senate bill 860; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

## SENATE

FRIDAY, MAY 15, 1942

Rev. William H. Pinkerton, D. D., pastor of the National City Christian Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Dear Lord, we rejoice to believe that Thy presence is extended to us through the operations of Thy Holy Spirit, which radiates as assuredly from Thy personality as the quickening energies from the sun make strong the oak as well as beautiful the flower. We approach Thee only that our hearts may join in prayer, because we feel our need of Thee in these strenuous times. We pray that the hearts of the Members of the Senate may be opened to Thy presence, and that the inspiration of Thy Holy Spirit may guide them in all the transactions of this great body, which is so essential to-day, and feels the weight of heavy responsibility. Bless them, we pray Thee, and direct them, we ask in Thy dear name. Amen.

#### THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, May 14, 1942, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

#### MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 7008) to authorize the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to issue notes, bonds, and debentures in the sum of \$5,000,000,000 in excess of existing authority, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

#### CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. HILL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Bulow	Danaher
Andrews	Bunker	Downey
Austin	Burton	Doxey
Ball	Butler	George
Bankhead	Byrd	Gerry
Barkley	Capper	Gillette
Bilbo	Caraway	Glass
Bone	Chavez	Guffey
Brooks	Clark, Idaho	Gurney
Brown	Clark, Mo.	Hayden

Hill	Millikin	Spencer
Holman	Murdock	Stewart
Hughes	Norris	Taft
Johnson, Calif.	Nye	Thomas, Okla.
Johnson, Colo.	O'Daniel	Truman
La Follette	O'Mahoney	Tunnell
Langer	Pepper	Tydings
Lee	Radcliffe	Vandenberg
McCarran	Reynolds	Van Nuys
McFarland	Rosier	Wagner
McKellar	Russell	Walsh
McNary	Schwartz	Wheeler
Maloney	Smathers	Willis
Maybank	Smith	

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD], and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] are members of the Committee to Investigate National Defense, and are, therefore, necessarily absent.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], the Senators from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER and Mr. OVERTON], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HERRING], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], and the Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN] are necessarily absent.

Mr. AUSTIN. The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is absent as a result of an injury and illness.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] is out of the city in attendance upon the sessions of the so-called Truman committee.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is absent on official business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Seventy-one Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

#### PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were presented and referred as indicated:

By Mr. CAPPER:

Petitions, numerous signed, of members of the McCune Christian Church, of McCune, and sundry citizens of St. John and Hoisington, all in the State of Kansas, praying for the enactment of the bill (S. 860) to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States and to provide for the suppression of vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; ordered to lie on the table.

By Mr. VANDENBERG:

A resolution adopted by a special meeting of the Executive Board and Joint Council of the United Packinghouse Workers of America, Local No. 69 (C. I. O.), in the State of Michigan, favoring the removal of restrictions from small packing companies so that they may have an equal share in furnishing supplies to the Government; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.